TRIBUTE TO IQBAL

By
MUMTAZ HASAN

By
DR. M. MOIZUDDIN

IQBAL ACADEMY PAKISTAN
116-McLEOD ROAD, LAHORE

TRIBUTE TO IQBAL

By

MUMTAZ HASAN

Collected and Edited

By

DR. M. MOIZUDDIN

IQBAL ACADEMY PAKISTAN
116-McLEOD ROAD, LAHORE

1st Edition	...	1982
Copies printed	...	1100
Price	...	[redacted]

Published by Dr. M. Moizuddin
Director, Iqbal Academy Pakistan
116 McLeod Road, Lahore

Printed at
Quddusi Printers
Nasir Park, Bilal Ganj, Lahore

CONTENTS

PREFACE

This book is a collection of articles on Allama Iqbal by Late Mumtaz Hassan on various aspects of Allama Iqbal's life. He was a great admirer of Allama Iqbal, and had an opportunity to see him many times at his old residence, McLeod Road, Lahore during his student life.

Mumtaz Hasan served as a Vice-President of the Iqbal Academy for more than a decade. He gave his life-blood for the development of the Academy. He was a man of great learning and took active part in all literary and cultural activities especially in the field of "Iqbaliat." He projected Allama's thoughts and Messages from different platforms. He was greatly impressed by the originality of Iqbal's thoughts, the high standard of his poetic genius, his contribution to the future well-being of the Muslims of the sub-continent and above all his vision for Pakistan.

In the end, I would like to extend my thanks and offer my gratitude to Mr. Imtiaz Hasan, a worthy son of late Mumtaz Hasan for providing some material on Iqbal from his illustrious father, on my request. I also offer my thanks to Mr. Farrukh Danial, Incharge Publications, for his un-grudging help at all stages.

(DR. M. MOIZUDDIN)

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Born : August 6, 1907.

Died : October 28, 1974.

Place of Birth : Talvandi Moosa Khan, District Gujranwala Punjab.

Academic Careers :

Attended St. Stephens College, Delhi—1923.

Forman Christian College, Lahore—1923—30.

Awarded the Honorary Degree of Doctorate of Law, by the University of the Punjab.

Also attended the University Law College Lahore in 1930—could not complete LL.B. then. He took up legal studies again at S.M. Law College, Karachi during his last days, but died before he was able to take the final examination.

Professional Engagements :

Appeared for the Indian Civil Services, Examination in the year 1930 and opted for the Indian Audit and Accounts Services held as I.C.S. and thereafter Posts held :

1. He began service on March 6, 1930 as the Under Secretary, Government of India.
2. Remained Private Secretary from 1930 to 1942 to the Viceroy Council.

3. Appointed Deputy Secretary, Government of India.
4. Served as Private Secretary to Quaid-i-Millat Liaqat Ali Khan, from the year 1942 to 1947. During this period he accompanied him alongwith Quaid-i-Azam Mohammad Ali Jinnah to the Round Table Conference in London.
5. After the creation of Pakistan he remained the Acting Governor of the State Bank of Pakistan 1952.
6. During the years 1952 to 1959 he was the Secretary Finance Government of Pakistan.
7. From 1959 to 1963 he was appointed the Deputy Chairman, Planning Commission of Pakistan.
8. He served as the Managing Director, National Bank of Pakistan from 1962 till 1967.

Honorary Posts held and services Rendered :

1. He was the Leader of the Military Commission for Europe and U.S.A. in 1951.
2. He served as the Chairman Pakistan Security Printing Corporation from 1955 to 1959.
3. Chaired the special Public Audit Committee for West Pakistan from 1969 to 1972.
4. Appointed Chairman National Pay Scale Commission from 1969 to 1972.
5. Acted as Chairman Broadcasting Commission of Pakistan during the year 1969 to 1972.
6. From 1970 to 1973 he presided over the Defence Services Pay Scale Commission.

7. He remained the Vice President of IQBAL ACADEMY Pakistan during the years 1962 to 1970.
8. Served the Pakistan Cultural Association as its President years 1965 to 1970.
9. He was associated with the Taraqqi-e-Urdu Board, Karachi as its President from 1958 to 1974.
10. Member, board of Governor, Islamic Research Institute, Islamabad.
11. Member Majlis-i-Nizam Anjuman-i-Taraqqi-i-Urdu) Pakistan.
12. Acted as President Majlis-i-Nawadirat, National Museum Karachi.
13. He remained the President Pak-German Forum, Karachi for many years.

In addition to all of these literary, Social and philanthropic activities, he attended numerous International and Commonwealth Conferences and Seminars representing Pakistan in Iran, Britain, W. Germany and U.S.A. on Cultural Missions. Particularly he visited Iran several times, twice on Special invitations from the Govt. of Iran. On one occasion he received a special gift of Persian Books packed in steel Cabinets for the IQBAL ACADEMY Pakistan from the Government of Iran.

(DR. M. MOIZUDDIN)

Iqbal and Some Modern World Problems

IQBAL, as a poet-prophet and a very-much-living mind of the present day, has come into violent contact with every movement of our times. He has something to say about every modern problem, and he never fails to give a clear verdict for or against the issues raised thereby. Out of the vast range of Iqbalic thought and feeling the present discussion chooses for itself only four problems, namely, Science, Democracy Materialism, and the Feminist Movement.

Iqbal and Science : The greatest issue raised by the advent of modern science is its relation to religion. The problem assumed immense proportions immediately after the doctrine of Evolution was published. The years that followed witnessed such conflicts between science and religion as are very well represented by Huxley's battle with the English Church. The fact is that men of science developed, in reaction to the orthodoxy that prevailed, a markedly irreligious attitude called Materialism. Since then science and religion have been taken to be mutually exclusive. There have been, however, many sensible efforts to include both of them in a harmonious scheme of human conduct, the most notable among such efforts being those of Eddington and Iqbal.

Iqbal interprets science as the conquest of matter, for science tries to grasp the constitution of the material world and to control it as far as possible. Iqbal visualizes the advance of science as a sort of moral conflict between man and matter. Once, in private conversation, he applied the word *Iblis* (the Muslim name for the Powers of Evil) to matter, thus emphasizing the necessity of man's conflict with nature.*

But Iqbal believes with Kant that the domain of science is limited to phenomena and does not extend to what Kant called Noumena. This belief runs as an undercurrent through his poetry. Religion is thus beyond Science, in the realm of the Noumena, where all questions are decided by the sway of emotion and faith rather than by syllogistic reasoning. There is no conflict between science and religion in Iqbal, as evidenced by one of his famous utterances :

Man banda-i-azadam ishq ast imam-i-man
Ishq ast imam-i-man, aqlast ghulam-i-man
(A free man am I, Love is my guide.
Love is my guide, and Reason is my slave).[1]

Here of course Love represents Religion and reason represents science. According to Iqbal, religion plays a higher role in the life of the individual than science does, but both can exist side by side without the possibility of conflict.

Iqbal and Democracy : Iqbal's views on democracy are a very usual subject for heated debate;

* Iqbal uses the word *Iblis* more for materialism than for matter. But he often uses it for both.

1. *Zabur-e-Ajm* P : 197

because there is a certain antithesis between the spirit of his various utterances on the subject. For one thing, he is a Muslim and as such believes in democratic principles. The whole atmosphere of the *Rumuz-i-bekhudi* or the "Secrets of Selfishness" is democratic. But then there is Iqbal's quest of the "Perfect Man," who will be head and shoulders above his fellows and will rule them by right. Iqbal has expressly said about democracy in the *Payam-i-Mashriq* (The Message of the East) : —

> Gurez az tarz-i-jamhuri, ghulam-i-pukhta kare shao
> Ki az maghz-i-du sad khar fikr-i-insane nami ayad.
>
> (Avoid the democratic method and become a slave to a person of experience.
> For two hundred asses' heads cannot bring forth the ideas of a man.)

In his own words, Iqbal prefers a democracy of aristocrats, bound together by ties of feeling and emotion, in fact such a brotherhood as Islam succeeded in creating in its initial stages. Nietzsche could not have thought of a democracy of aristocrats, because his aristocrat, the superman, is not constructed on a social basis at all, being without a trace of the tender emotions.

In reality it is Iqbal's great respect for the individual which leads him in those two opposite directions. He wants such free scope for the individual's development as democracy alone can offer, and he also wants the individual to develop into something intrinsically greater than himself. He has a greater bias in favour of the latter line of development than in favour of the former. It may therefore be said that he is not

enamoured of democracy, but accepts it because it is the only known system of government which provides for a free development of the individual.

Iqbal and Materialism : As a man who believes in the spiritual values of life, Iqbal looks down on materialism as a very narrow-minded attitude. Materialism prevents the human spirit from soaring to its legitimate aspirations. It is a clog on the soul. A man who thinks of life as a business proposition morally can never hope to lead a full life, because life cannot be full without emotional intensity, which throws material gain into the background.

Iqbal has condemned Western civilization because it is a materialistic system depending for maintenance on manpower and money power, and an atmosphere of selfish competition which kills sympathy and the feeling of brotherhood among men. Bernard Shaw's idea of civilization as a "conceit" is not far different from Iqbal's ideas. The poem entitled *Tahzib* illustrates it. Iqbal expects the present day civilization to collapse because it lacks moral foundation :

Tadabbur ki fasun kari se muhkam ho nahin sakta
Jahan men jis tamaddun ki bina sarmaya dari hai
(A civilization based on mere capitalism can never be made to last.)[1]

Iqbal is not an asectic. He does not preach seclusion and abstraction from the work-a-day world. As a matter of fact, he preaches just the other thing. "Look at it again and again" says he. "It is a thing worth-seeing" (Hai dekhne ki chiz ise bar bar dekh). But he

1. *Bang-i-Dara* P : 313

does not want us to worship the world or the things that are of it. We must not forget the higher needs of the spirit, such as religion and morality, and must never fail to satisfy them.

Iqbal and Feminism : Iqbal does not favour the modern women's movement because it tends to alienate them from their biological responsibility. The highest role of woman, according to Iqbal, is as mother of the race. The modern woman, however is developing an alarming individualism (owing, of course to her economic emancipation) and is protesting against her biological functions. Those who are gifted with any insight are beginning to recognize this tendency as a suicidal one. And among these men is Iqbal.

[*Forman Christian College Magazine, Vol. XXIV No. 3, 1933*].

The Educational Significance of Iqbal's Philosophy

Dr. Mahmud Husain, Dr. I.H. Qureshi, Ladies and Gentlemen!

It is very great honour for me to be asked to speak at this Seminar on a subject of such importance. I do not propose to give any detailed exposition of the educational significance of Iqbal's philosophy, but I would like to content myself with a few suggestions and indications of the directions in which I feel his philosophy points. The purpose of all education is to make men out of human beings or as the great Ghalib has said 'to convert *Admi* into *Insan*!' Iqbal is deeply, profoundly interested in this purpose of education. As a thinker his outlook is primarily moral, not ontological. He is more concerned with the problems of human conduct, the development of human personality, and the future of the human race as a whole than with the investigations of the foundations of human knowledge like Immanuel Kant or other philosophers. In the *Rumuz-e-Bekhudi* he has related an incident of his own youth, when he was rude to a poor beggar who came to the door of his house and his rudeness caused great distress to his father. "What shall I say to the Prophet on the Day of Judgement,"

said the old man to his son, his eyes filled with tears, "when he asks me why I failed to teach you the elements of humanity":

حق جوانے مسلمے با تو سپرد او نصیبے از دبستانم نبرد

از تو این یک کار آسان هم نه شد یعنی آن انبار گل آدم نه شد[1]

God gave a Muslim youth in your charge
And he learnt nothing of my way of life.
You could not accomplish even this little task.
You could not make a human being out of this heap of clay.

The basic thought of Iqbal is concerned with the various stages of human development, the factors that help that development and the factors that hinder it. The development of the self is based on self-knowledge, self-expression, and self-control. The mention of the human self has a background which I think has been explained, more than I could, by Dr. Mahmud Husain. He has referred to Iqbal's saying that all life is individual. There is no such thing as universal life: God Himself is an Individual. He is the most unique individual. The Prophet has said : تخلقوا باخلاق الله *i.e.*, Cultivate in yourselves the Attributes of the Almighty. As man emulates God he becomes more and more God-like, more and more unique. The ideal at which Iqbal is aiming in his philosophy is a Kingdom of God on earth, which for him means, in his own words, 'the democracy of more or less unique individuals presided over by the most unique individual possible on the earth.' This idea of *Khudi*

1. *Asrar-e-Rumuz* : 151

or self, as has already been pointed out by Dr. Mahmud Husain in his learned address, is basic to the whole thought of Iqbal as an educationist and more important as an educator. He points to the building up of human personality, to the promotion and encouragement of human personality, to the promotion and encouragement of those elements and those factors which make for that development, and he wishes us to get away from the contrary factors which destroy personality, which annihilate it. These are two basic attitudes which we have seen in the history of human thought, One is that the self is something which is somewhat inconvenient, causes a lot of discomfort, particularly because of the burden of responsibility that goes with it ; and therefore the sooner the self disappears the sooner it is absorbed into a bigger entity, the better. This has been the idea of *Pantheism* and of a number of other creeds. One need not go into the details of that. Iqbal gets away from that altogether. He regards the existence of the self, the development of the self, the strengthening of the self as something desirable in itself. For that purpose, in order to strengthen the self, he has, as I have already mentioned, put before us the ideal of Deity. We have got to be like God. We shall never become God. God and man are two different things. And here again this is a basic thought : While man will never become God and God does not become man, man in his pursuit of the ideal, which is God, becomes more and more God-like. Eevery man has an individuality which needs to be brought out, promoted and emphasized. It is this which is the main purpose of education. It is only

then that a human being will be able to take his place in the great society to which Iqbal has pointed.

The way the self builds itself is through constant endeavour, pursuit of ideals, maintaining a state of tension, a state of effort, all the time. If there is relaxation, there is death. Life means activity, creative activity. Man in this universe is a junior collaborator of God. He is not, as Dr. Mahmud Husain has put it so beautifully, a servile person in a universe which is dictated to by Almighty God. But it is a kind of cooperative effort. God, being the supreme Creator, is always ahead of man. Going ahead, He is not static. He is not sitting there like a target to be shot at. Man is pursuing Him and He is moving ahead. This means, as I have said, constant effort, persistent endeavour, pursuit of ideals and gradual self-development in this manner. Another basic thought in Iqbal is, of course, that Iqbal has given a number of ideas in regard to the way the personality develops, incentred in *Itaat* and *Zabt-i-Nafs* and so on, ending with the stage of man being vicegerent on earth. As I said, I would like to stick to the main ideas. One of the main ideas of Iqbal which should interest all educationists is that he does not think of humanity as divided between those who are valuable to an educator or educationist and those that are not. Every human being in his own words is 'a latent centre of power capable of being developed to heights of selfhood if he is given proper opportunity and proper guidance., Here, of course, we come into clash with the thought of Nietszche who regards humanity as divided between patricians and plebians and he

thought that the plebian was not worth the trouble; only the patrician was. Iqbal does not agree and he points to the experiment made by Islam where by the so called plebian material, the most humble was raised to the greatest heights of achievement. If Ipbal has to guide our educationists, they have to remember that every human being has something in him which is worth attention, which is worth training, worth promotion, worth education.

The self does not develop in isolation. It might grow wild if it did. Society is the context in which it has to develop. Here again I have to draw on the very clear and learned exposition of Dr. Mahmud Husain himself. As he has pointed out, Iqbal wishes to maintain a balance between the claims of the individual and society. He is not with those who want to turn the individual human being into a commodity in the so-called interest of a greater social unit, nor is he with those who think that for one man or two men, the whole society should exist as a subservient kind of medium. Society and the individual need each other. Society must consis of individuals. And, mind you, when we think of European society, and the European scholars point back to the Graeco-Roman civilization, to the glorious days of Greece, to the grand days of Rome, they fail to tell us that nine-tenths of that society consisted of slaves. This is not the kind of society that Iqbal thinks of. Every human being has got to pull his full weight. He has to be a self-contained, independent, useful unit of that society. And the ideal to be achieved as I have already submitted, is a state of

society consisting of highly developed unique indivi-dulas.

Then you know the various trends of various schools of education today. Very often people are taught to regard themselves as belonging to one particular human group to the exclusion of other groups. Iqbal emphasizes the oneness of the human race. While there may be some description just for the purpose of recognition, there is no barrier standing between man and in the thought of Iqbal. I think Professor Nicholson, with all respect to him, has gone somewhat wrong, and he has not given adequate apperciation to the thought of Iqbal on this particular point. He thinks that Iqbal stands only for the Muslims. Iqbal would certainly like to see Islam established in this world. But Islam being the ideal for Iqbal, he presents it to the whole of humanity. He does not wish that only a group should be given this ideal. He does not wish to differentiate between one group and the other. If something is good, and Iqbal thinks that Islam is good, he has presented it to the whole of humanity. This of course is one of the basic thoughts of Islam itself. We as Muslims, by the very definition, are committed to the idea of one humanity, and in our thoughts, in our outlook on life we have to get away from European nationalism and from modern racialism. All forms of exploitation between man and man, and nationalism and racialism and imperialism and economic inequalities and the rest of them are some forms of such manifestation. They divide man from man and they obscure

that ideal which Iqbal presents to us. Again in trying to build up the concept of human personality Iqbal wants a balance between toughness and softness. You remember his famous verses:

مصاف زندگی میں سیرت فولاد پیدا کر
شبستان محبت میں حریر و پرنیاں ہو جا
گزر جا بن کے سیل تند روکوہ و بیاباں سے
گلستاں راہ میں آئے تو جوئے نغمہ خواں ہو جا[1]

When it is a question of fighting the battle of life be hard as steel.

But when you are away from that battle you should be as soft as silk.

This again is something where as an educator Iqbal differs from many people whose names are often bracketed with his, Neitszche's for instance. Neitszche does not wish to have softness with toughness. He is all for toughness. He was fascinated by the thought of the stronger getting hold of the weaker and destroying him. Again there is also the idea in Iqbal which is one of the fundamental ideas of inner harmony and the harmony of the man with his environment. In this connection there are a number of concepts which come to mind as embodied in words Iqbal has used quite frequently such as *Ilm*, *Amal*, *Ishq*, *Aql*. *Ishq* is the creation of ideals, and our dedication to those ideals. *Ishq* has scope in this universe because the universe is not perfect. The universe has got to be made perfect—in any case it has got to progress towards perfection, in a greater degree of perfection.

1. *Bang-e-Dara* P : 312

Aql is the critical faculty, it is the assessment of consequences of one's actions. When Iqbal sometimes runs down *Aql* it does not mean that he wants us to become irrational. No, *Aql*, reason, has its place and a very important place in life. What he wishes to say is this that while it is a good thing for us to weigh the consequences of any action that we undertake, there are certain ideals which are too important for us to be weighing these consequences. It may be that they demand some sacrifice and while the ordinary man who thinks he is a reasonable man will always be weighing the pros and cons of his actions and may not be able to throw his life into that endeavour which he may think as risky. Iqbal comes and says, "Look, if there is an ideal really worth pursuing, pursue it even if it brings you a certain amount of hardship, even if you have to sacrifice.'' Then comes *Ilm*. The question of *Ilm* is most important. Very often we are misled by the word *Ishq* in Iqbal and we often feel that he has run down *Ilm*, that is, knowledge. But he does not run it down. Actually he has emphasized again and again the importance of the knowledge of *Anfus and Afaq*, *i.e.*, the inner universe and the outer universe and also the history of human events in space and time. We have to learn from the experiences of humanity. Unless we study history we won't know how to direct our future course. Unless we have immersed ourselves in the pursuit of knowledge we won't really get to know the real core of life. But equally important, if not more important, to us is the knowledge of the outer universe. If you throw yourself against material obstacles, if you want to conquer

nature, subdue the forces of universe around you to the advantage of man; you are bringing out your own potentialities, developing your own personality, pursuing creative effort in the path of that development. Iqbal has emphasized knowledge of the outer universe and I would like to quote two or three of his verses from *Payam-i-Mashriq.*

علم اشیا علم الاسما ستے — هم عصاؤ هم ید بیضا ستے
گفت حکمت را خدا خیر کثیر — بر کجا این خیر را بینی بگیر
علم اشیا داد مغرب را فروغ — حکمت او ماست می بندد زدوغ

There he says that the knowledge of things in the outer world is the most essential form of knowledge. Actually the word *Hikmat* in Arabic also refers to that knowledge which relates to the outer world. Iqbal points to the progress that the West has made, the progress which is all too obvious to us and from which we people have suffered in this part of the world in Asia and Africa in general. It is for us to develop our knowledge of the outer world, the scientific techniques, the techniques of observation and experiment in order to master those forces of nature which have to be mastered in our service. So I would submit that this part of *Ilm* is the most important today from the point of view of the development of human personality.

Lastly, Ladies and Gentlemen, I would say that the whole complexion of Iqbal's thought is optimistic. As I have pointed out elsewhere, this is one of the fundamental conditions of being a Muslim. If once you despair, you lose hope in the future of the race and the future of life, in the future of the universe, then

you cease to be Muslims, and certainly you cease to be influenced by Iqbal. The Quran is very positive. At one place it says, "Do not despair of the Grace of God, none but the unbelievers despair." And Iqbal has again and again tried to renew our flagging spirits, our drooping hearts and he has pointed to the great future that lies ahead of us as a race. In one of his very great verses he has said, "All that ought to be and has not been that will happen. That is what will come to pass. And whatever has happened and should not happen it will disappear from our midst." These are some of the very broad and brief indications of the directions in which Iqbal's influence will take us in the field of education. I think that in this country, in this Pakistan of ours, if we have to build a future worthy of ourselves and worthy of the world of which we are becoming increasingly important member, by the Grace of God, we have to take careful note of these ideals, these values which Iqbal has placed before us so that we may prove worthy of ourselves and of those who will come after us.

Read in a Seminar at the Jamia Iqbal's Educational Institute of Education, Malir, Karachi in collaboration with the Iqbal Acadmy. published in "*Iqbal and Education*."

Iqbal—Recollections*

It is a rare privilege for a mortal to share even a few moments of the life of an immortal.

Looking back over the years, I am filled with a sense of pride at having known the man to whom we all owe so much. Not that I was an intimate friend : there were many indeed, who knew him better and many who had known him longer. Nor, I should say, is intimacy always an advantage where the great ones are concerned. As Emerson said, we cannot see a mountain near ; a little distance certainly helps to see better.

I had my first glimpse of him in 1925 when he came to deliver a public lecture at the Islamia College, Lahore. The lecture was delivered from a written paper and took over an hour. The college hall and the galleries were packed full of people who were listening in pin-drop silence. He was speaking on a difficult subject and his voice was calm and clear. Suddenly some backbencher, who to this day remains anonymous, shouted from a far corner of the hall : "Loudly and slowly please ! We cannot follow you, Doctor Iqbal !" This looked like sheer impertinence, pure and simple, an attempt to attract attention. The way in which this interruption had been hurled on the audience made

*Obatined through the courtesy of the author Mr. Imtiaz Hasan, son of the late Mr. Mumtaz Hasan.

it clear that the gentleman who demanded a louder voice and slower delivery from the speaker, knew next to nothing of what the lecture was about. A number of angry eyes turned towards him. There was only one man in the hall to whom all this did not seem to make the slightest difference and that was Iqbal himself. Wearing a dark European suit with a Turkish cap, and an Olympian smile on his face, he stood as though nothing had happened. "I can speak more slowly if you like," said he without so much as lifting a brow, "but I cannot speak more loudly." This was followed by a silence even more profound than before, and the vociferous aspirant to fame sank back shamefacedly in his seat.

This first glimpse of Iqbal filled me with a desire to meet him in person. This happened on an unforgettable day early in 1926, when I was able to persuade a friend to go with me to the great man's house. We felt we had to go together as neither of us had enough courage to accomplish the task unaided.

In those days he used to live in bungalow No. 34 on McLeod Road, Lahore. His still well-known abode in Anarkali had been abandoned in favour of this particular house a few years earlier. This, like his previous houses, had been hired on rent, and he continued to live here until he moved into his own house on Mayo Road about three years before his death. It was an old building with a compound that became smaller and smaller as the years went on, as the landlord encroached more and more on it to build more houses to earn more rent. The general impression that the visitor gathered about the place was by no means

heightened by the sight of an ancient name-board which bore some faint indication of having been painted once upon a time in the dim and distant past. If you were really wanting to know who lived in the house, you could certainly not get much help from that name-board.

Here we were then, standing at the entrance of the sanctum sanctorum, with a noisy cinema on the right and a few nondescript buildings on the left. We wavered. The house was certainly not imposing, but the greatness of the man that lived in it still seemed to hold us at a distance. In that house lived the Poet-Philosopher of the East. And then, was he not also a Knight—Doctor Sir Mohammad Iqbal, Bar-at-law, etc., etc ? And yet there was something in that house that seemed to beckon us towards itself. We entered in awe and reverence. Knowing the pomp and circumstances that attended the knighted gentry of Lahore in those days, we thought we had to go through the usual formalities before we could be summoned to the presence. It was in the midst of these thoughts that I found myself addressing a dark thin middle aged servant dressed in a loose shirt and "lungi" in the Punjabee style. I handed him our visiting cards (which we had been careful enough to acquire) and asked him whether it was possible to see the Doctor Sahib. Would he kindly obtain permission for us ? This individual who was no other than the now world famous Ali Bakhsh, looked at us with some surprise. "There is no need for any permission," said he. "You see the Doctor Sahib sitting there in the verandah. Why don't you go and sit down with him ?" My friend

and I were not quite sure that this suggestion was intended seriously, or that a meeting with the great man could be arranged with such lack of ceremony. I therefore, requested Ali Bakhsh again to take our cards to Doctor Sahib and get us permission for an interview. Ali Bakhsh smiled, but did not oppose the request any longer. I saw him walk up to his master who sat on an easy chair in the verandah, and say something to him. I do not think he ever made any use of the visiting cards at all. Having spoken, he turned towards us, and simply waved us permission to come forward. We walked to the verandah and sat on two chairs which were near the Poet's own easy chair. There were other chairs too. And of course the well-known "hookah", the Poet's inseparable companion.

Iqbal asked us about ourselves and we told him we were students. Then without waiting for any further conversation, I shot a question at him, which I had been wanting to ask. "Sir", said I with all the vehemence characteristic of student immaturity, "you are one of the greatest philosophers of our time, and are regarded as an eminently rational human being. But you seem to be wedded to a most irrational and untenable belief, I mean your belief in God." I proceeded to add, "You know how impossible it is, after Kant, for any one to say that the existence of God can either be proved or disproved. How is then that you find no difficulty in saying that God exists? If you have the same kind of excuse as Kant gave, I must say it is unconvincing." Iqbal did not feel at all displeased or surprised at my rhapsody which was obviously

the result of my recent contact with the *Critiques* of Immanuel Kant. He turned to me quietly and said, "I have seen Him". I thought I saw a faint smile on his lips, as he puffed at the "hookah." After a while, he continued, "There are moments in a man's life when he can experience God. Such moments are, however, rare," he added, a little later, "very rare." "Can anyone and everyone have that experience ?" I asked. "No one is shut out", was the answer, "but he who wants it has to wait for it."

The conversation turned upon death. "Death," said Iqbal, "does not exist. It is life that is the predominant reality, not death."

By this time, a number of other people had also arrived unannounced and uninvited, and had formed a circle round him. The conversation turned on all kinds of things, which did not seem to interest us, and we asked for permission to depart. The permission was duly given. It consisted in an imperceptible nod of the head.

From that day onwards, I saw him regularly. There never was any fixed time for interviews. I have sat with him at all hours, sometimes as late as two o'clock in the morning. I do not remember ever having called without seeing him. He seldom went out of the house. It would indeed have caused a sensation in Lahore if he had been seen walking on the road or shopping. He sometimes did go to public meetings and social functions, but these occasions were so rare that they hardly mattered. His comparative lack of physical activity found more than ample compensation

in his unceasing effort in the realm of the mind and the spirit. His reading was vast and varied, although one never could know when he found time for it. And in the midst of the reading and the conversation and the philosophizing came poetic inspiration, like the sun breaking through the clouds.

The daily gatherings at this house were something unique. I have never seen a man who found himself so much at home in such a variety of company. Scientists, literary men, politicians, Government officials, shop-keepers, college students, travellers, the highest of the high and the lowest of the low, all came. And all were welcome. There was no distinction of caste, creed or colour among his callers. And they talked of many things—poetry, philosophy, religion, politics, science, sex, everything. There was nothing under the sun that was taboo. It was nothing unusual to see the conversation turn from the rise and fall of civilizations to the various ways in which the "pulao" is cooked in various countries. I remember a whole afternoon when for hours he spoke of nothing but the art of wrestling.

During these conversations he always seemed eager to hear others rather than speak himself. There were, however, so many things that people asked him that he invariably had to do a good deal of talking. There were plenty of young students, for instance, who came to inflict questions on him. He himself had a student's eagerness for knowledge and was never happier than when someone told him something he did not know before. He was deeply interested in all the mainfesta-

tions of the human spirit. Indeed there was hardly anythir g in life that did not interest him. He is great among those that have known and loved life.

He never bestowed much thought on his dress. He was sometimes seen wearing an immaculate European suit while very often he sat among his visitors in the well-known Punjabee deshabille consisting of nothing more than an under-vest and a sheet of cloth tied loosely round the waist. As he puffed at the "hookah", his eyes seemed to take on a dreamy look. The "hookah" helped conversation and it was always one of Ali Bakhsh's major responsibilities to keep it going.

He had a characteristically kind humour which gave a buoyancy to his conversation. It was never dull to talk to him. He spoke to people at their level and nothing was further from him than any idea of showing off. In his afternoon gatherings, he often spoke of poetry, but hardly ever referred to his own work. It was very seldom and in a more restricted circle that he sometimes recited his own verses. I had the good fortune to hear him on several such occasions. At one time, some of us organized an evening class to hear him on some of his own poems. This, however, was a short-lived experiment.

He was a firm believer in the greatness of the human individual. I remember how he protested when someone spoke disparagingly of the large majority of human beings. "God," said Iqbal, "has given every human being something which he has not given to others. Anyone who despises his fellow beings does so out of ignorance." Was not this man a lover of

mankind ?

It is impossible to write briefly about one who was so amazingly many-sided and filled such a large place in the sphere of poetry, philosophy, religion and national life. Iqbal is the first man in the East who understood Western civilization. He is also the first to understand the spirit of Islam in the context of modern philosophical concepts, And he is also the man who first saw the vision of a new state in Indo-Pakistan subcontinent, and gave its inner content to the Pakistan movement. These are great achievements, but the man was greater than his work. He was one of those whose work is never finished, who seek to remould the whole of this "Sorry Scheme of Things" nearer to their heart's desire, and find that eternity is not enough for the task.

I saw him last after his death. It was not Iqbal that I saw, but only the physical frame in which he lived and moved and had his being. There was a smile on those familiar lips. And as I stood beside the bed on which he lay, the words he had said twelve years ago came back to me. Did death exist ? I wondered. For whatever power death may hold over other men, it certainly had none over Iqbal. He did not and could not die. For him and the like of him, death certainly does not exist.

A Day in the Life of Muhammad Iqbal

THIS is the record of an interview which I had with Mian Ali Bakhsh, the life-long servant and companion of Muhammad Iqbal, on the evening of the 23rd September 1957, at Lahore. The interview took place at 9-30 p.m. in the drawing room of Javid Manzil, No. 3-A Mayo Road which is the house built by Iqbal for himself before his death. Dr. Javid Iqbal, son of the poet, and Mr. Feroz-ud-Din, Master of the Pakistan Mint at Lahore, were present at the interview. The interview took the form of questions and answers and centred round the routine of the typical day in the life of the poet. The conversation was conducted in Punjabi, which is Mian Ali Bakhsh's mother tongue.

Q. When did Iqbal usually get up in the morning ?

A. Very early. As a matter of fact, he slept very little. He was keen on his morning prayer. After the prayer he read the Qur'an.

Q. In what manner did he read the Qur'an ?

A. Before his throat was affected, he used to recite the Qur'an in a clear and melodious voice. Even after he got the throat disease[1] he used to read

1. Throat disease : I am not in a position to say what the precise nature of this malady was, but Syed Nazir Niazi in his famous article, "On the Last Days of Iqbal", has described the symptoms and treatment in some detail. The disease resulted in loss of voice and was never cured.

the Qur'an but not loudly.

Q. What did he usually do after he had finished his prayer and recitation?

A. He used to sit in an easy-chair. I would prepare his "hookah"[1] and place it before him. He would study the briefs of cases which were to come up in court that day. Now and then, while still at his files, he would have moments of poetic inspiration.

Q. How did you know when he was in his poetic mood?

A. He would call me and say: "Bring my note book and my pencil." When I brought these, he would write down the verses in pencil. Now and then, when he did not feel satisfied with his composition, he was extremely restless. While composing, he would often ask for the Qur'an to be brought to him. Even otherwise he called for the Qur'an a number of times a day.

Q. What time did he usually go to court when he was practising at the bar?

A. He used to leave 15 or 20 minutes before court time. As long as he lived in Anarkali[2] he used to go to

---

1. The "hookah" is a smoking pipe with a long tube. The smoke is drawn through a vase filled with water to which a tube and a bowl are attached. It is very common in villages in Pakistan, and still quite familiar in cities. The common English word for it is hubble-bubble.
2. Anarkali is the main commercial center of Lahore. Iqbal lived in a house in Anarkali after his return from Europe upto 1922. The house is no longer in existence but it stood where the New Market stands now. Iqbal moved from this house to the house at No. 34 McLeod Road, where he lived till 1935. This was the last rented house in which he lived. In 1935 he moved to Javid Manzil, No. 3-A Mayo Road, which he had built for himself and named after his son Javid (now Dr. Javid Iqbal), and it was in this house that he died on the 21st April 1938.

court in his horse carriage. Later, he bought a car.

Q. Did his legal practice mean a great deal of work? Or was it very little?

A. He did not wish to involve himself beyond a point in his law practice. Usually when he got cases that could bring him fees of about Rs. 500/- a month. He refused further briefs and would tell the parties to come next month. If the sum of Rs. 400/- or 500/- was secured during the first 3 or 4 days of a month, he did not accept any more work during the rest of the month.

Q. What is the particular significance of this figure of Rs. 500/-?

A. He estimated that he did not need more than this amount for his monthly expenses. This in the old days included the rent of the house, the wages of servants, the salary of the "Munshi"[1] and the general expenses of the household. This estimate, of course, held good only in the days when he was living in Anarkali and McLeod Road.

Q. How long was he active as a legal practitioner?

A. He was in practice until he got his throat disease which was round about 1932 or 1933.

Q. How did he catch his throat disease?

A. He went to say his Eid prayer. It was winter time. When he came back home he had *Siwayyan*[2] with curd which was his favourite dish. His throat was affected the very next day. That

---

1. "Munshi" is a pleader's clerk. Iqbal's Munshi was the late Mr. Tahir-ud-Din, who is addition to looking after Iqbal's legal work became the inventor of "Dilroz", an ointment for skin disease.
2. "Siwayyan" is the Pakistani version of the Italian vermicelli.

night he kept coughing till two or half past two and by the next morning he had lost his voice. This lasted till his death.

Q. If I may go back to his daily routine, what did he do on return from court ?

A. Before doing anything else he used to ask me to help him take off his court clothes. He was never fond of formal dress[1] and used to put it on only for the court and that also with an effort. He wanted to get rid of court clothes as soon as he came back home. He always hated formal dress.

Q. What did he do after changing his dress ?

A. He composed verses whenever he felt like it. For this purpose he would ask for his note book, a pencil and the Qur'an as usual.

Q. Did he pay serious attention to his law practice ?

A. If he had a case the next day, he would look into the case file, otherwise he did not concern

1. Dress : Iqbal's dress at home was a loose shirt (sometimes only an under shirt) and a "tahmad", which is a lose sheet of cloth tied round the waist and knotted in front. This is typical Punjabee deshabille. In winter he would wrap himself in a warm shawl or blanket. On occasions he was somewhat more elaborately, though never very formally, dressed.

When he went out, he usually wore European clothes. If on any particular occasion he had to go to a formal dinner he would wear evening dress but he used a ready-made bow tie. Either he did not know how to tie one for himself, or he did not have enough patience to go through the exercise.

Iqbal used a variety of head dresses. He sometimes wore a red fez, often a turban in the Punjabee style and occasionally a black cap which was a modified version of the popular head-wear of Kemal Ataturk. Often he was bare headed. His formal dress also consisted very often of "achkan" and shalwar" or an open collar frock coat and shalwar.

himself with case work.

Q. Did he do any other legal work at home ?

A. He did not do anything except see papers which might be needed in court the next day.

Q. Did he sleep in the afternoon ?

A. Not usually, but he did so now and then.

Q. Did he sleep well ?

A. He was a very light sleeper. He got disturbed and woke up at the least noise.

Q. Could he bear physical pain and discomfort ?

A. No. He was very soft-hearted. He could not bear pain himself nor could he bear the sight of any one else in pain. And he could not stand the sight of blood at all. He was once stung by a hornet one of his feet. This put him so completely out of action that he needed my support to move about. On one occasion, Javid, who was then a little child, got hurt on his eyebrow and bled a little. When Iqbal saw blood he fainted away.

Q. At what time did he take his meals ?

A. Between 12 and 1 o'clock in the day. He ate only one meal. Normally he did not eat in the evening.

Q. What were his favourite dishes ?

A. He was fond of *pulao*.[1] *mash-ki-dal*[2] seasoned

1. *Pulao* is a meat and rice dish of Iranian origin which is a favourite with Muslims in Pakistan and India. Iqbal was a great connoisseur of *pulao* and was familiar with its many variations and the method of its preparation in a number of countries, both European and Oriental. He said once that one of the great blessings that God had conferred on Muslims was the excellent quality of *pulao* rice produced in Muslims countries.

2. *Mash-ki-dal* is a variety of lentil.

seasoned with *ghee*[1], *karela*[2] stuffed with minced meat, and also *khushka*.[3]

Q. Did he like many dishes at his meals ?

A. No, there were only a few dishes at a time. He was a poor eater.

Q. Did he dislike any particular dish ?

A. Yes, *siri pae*[4] and *tinda*[5] cooked with meat.

Q. Did he take any exercise ?

A. In the early days, he did. In those days he used dum-bells, and performed *dand*[6]. This he used to do while he was in Anarkali. After that he gave up physical exercise.

Q. Was he interested in games and sports ?

A. He was interested in watching wrestling matches?[7]

Q. What were his other hobbies ?

A. In his earlier days he was fond of keeping and breeding pigeons. Now and then he would play cards.

Q. Was he in the habit of going out in the evening ?

---

1. *Ghee* is butter fat melted and refined.
2. *Karela* (*Momoridica charantia*) is a vegetable and in the form (*i.e.*, stuffed with minced mea') is a favourite dish in Pakistan.
3. *Khushka* is plain boiled rice. It is a favourite dish with the Muslims of Kashmir. Iqbal hailed from Kashmir.
4. *Siri Pae* : Literally, the word means "skulls and legs." It is a dish made of a goat's or sheep's skull and legs, boiled and cooked spices.
5. *Tinda* is a vegetable.
6. *Dand* : *Dand* is a favourite exercise with "pahlwans" or wrestlers. You have to put your hands on the ground, stretch your legs as far as possible and flex your arms until your chest touches the ground. Then your stretch your arms and revert to the original position.
7. Wrestling Matches : Iqbal was publicly at a famous wrestling match between the late Gunga Pahlwan and Imam Bukhsh Pahlwan at Minto Park in Lahore in 1922. The Minto Park is now named after Iqbal himself and is called Iqbal Park.

A. Getting out in the evening was almost an impossibility with him. In the earlier days when he was living inside Bhati Gate[1], he would sometimes walk as far as the platform outside the house of Hakim Shahbazuddin[2]. Once in a while Sir Zulfiqar Ali[3] would come in his car[4] and take him out.

Q. When did he go to sleep in the evening ?

A. In the evening a number of friends and visitors used to call on him. Choudhry Mohammad Husain[5] was always the last to leave. These sittings went on till 9 or 10 o'clock. After this he sat alone with Ch. Mohammad Husain and recited to him the verses he had composed during the day.

Q. How long did Choudhry Sahib normally stay ?

A. Upto 12 or 1 o'clock in the night. After this Doctor Sahib[6] would go to bed, but would get

---

1. Bhati Gate : This is one of the main gates of the old walled city of Lahore. Iqbal lived in two houses inside Bhati Gate before he proceeded to England in 1905.
2. Hakim Shahbazuddin was a great friend of the poet. His house is still together intact with the famous platform on which Iqbal and many of his friends used to gather in the evenings for the chat.
3. Sir Zulfiqar Ali was a prominent member of the ruling family of Malerkotla and a great friend of Iqbal. He is the author of the first important book on poet, entitled *A Voice from the East* (published in Lahore, 1922).
4. Sir Zulfiqar Ali's car was a Talbot Sunbeam. One of Iqbal's poems centres round this car.
5. Ch. Mohammad Husain was the Superintendent of the Press Branch of the Punjab Government. He was granted the title of "Khan Bahadur" by the British Government towards the end of his service. He was an intimate friend and a constant companion of Iqbal, who has referred to him in the introduction of the *Payam-e-Mashriq*.
6. Doctor Sahib : Iqbal was known to most of his friend and frequent visitors as "Doctor Sahib".

up for his *Tahajjud*[2] prayer after he had hardly slept for two or three hours.

Q. Did he ever lose his temper?

A. He was very kind-hearted by nature and was seldom angry. But when he was roused he lost control over himself. I remember an instance of his kindheartedness. On one occasion a thief was caught red-handed in the house and some of us gave him a beating. Iqbal asked us not to beat the thief. On the contrary he gave him a meal and sent him away.

Q. Did he say his *Tahajjud* prayer regularly?

A. Yes, regularly.

Q. And after the *Tahajjud*?

A. He used to lie down for a short while until it was time for the morning prayer, when he would get up again.

Q. Did he compose his verses during the night?

A. Yes. On occasions the poetic mood would come to him. This often happened round about two or two-thirty in the morning. He would then call for me and ask me to bring his note book and pencil.

[*Extract from Mohammad Iqbal*, Karachi 1960, pp. 133-39].

---

2. *Tahajjud* is a prayer that comes before the morning prayer. It is supererogatory and is performed only by the devout Muslims.

Iqbal as a Seer*

IQBAL symbolizes the renaissance of Islam in the twentieth century, a regeneration of its intellectual movement and the spirit of its culture. His life forms an interesting study for us from more than one point of view. In the first place, he represents a process of mental and spiritual development starting from modern nationalism, but moving away from it as its incompatibility with the broad human outlook of Islam unfolded itself to him, and as he studied the political and cultural limitations of modern nationalism at close quarters in Europe and in the subcontinent. This process of development is, in certain respects, shared by the other two leaders of the Pakistan movement, Syed Ahmad Khan and Jinnah both of whom started with the idea of Indian nationalism but had to renounce it later in the light of experience.

Secondly, Iqbal defined and indentified the fundamental values of Islam in the context of modern thought. Where does Islam stand in the currents and cross-currents of modern scientific and philosophical concepts? How do we find our bearings in these new surroundings and what path are we to take to reach our goal? What part can Islam play in the modern

*Text of a speech delivered on the occasion of the presentation ceremony of *Iqbal in Pictures*, compiled by Fakir Syed Wahiduddin, to the Museums Association of Pakistan. Reproduced with permission.

world with its national and racial strife and its social, economic and cultural antagonisms? These were some of the important questions that presented themselves to Iqbal, on which he spent a life-time of study. For him, Islam was not a mere device for Muslims to adjust themselves to the changing conditions around them; it was a living force for freeing the outlook of man from his geographical and racial limitations and for fashioning a new world out of the old. It had its own course to pursue in the future as in the past. Iqbal believed that "Islam is itself destiny and will not suffer a destiny."

Iqbal's contribution towards the education of the Muslim consciousness in our time is vast and versatile. He was an outstanding scholar of Arabic and Persian and knew Sanskrit. He also knew German. In English, he has a style of his own—a clear, concise, compact style. He was acknowledged as an outstanding Islamist by the world of scholarship, and a number of European scholars and Orientalists were in correspondence with him on matters of academic and historical interest. His poetic genius found spontaneous expression in his philosophical poems, *Asrar-i-Khudi* and *Ramuz-i-Bekhudi*—The Secrets of the Self and The Mysteries of Selflessness—which convey, in words of rare beauty, the vital meaning and message of Islam. Above all. he focused his attention on the political conflict and intellectual crisis of the world of the early twentieth century and, in that context, made a serious study of the social and cultural foundations of Islam and of the principle of movement inherent in its structure. In his

Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam, he put forword an ordered philosophy and pointed the way to the revitalisation of Muslim society. He has written some of the greatest poetry ever produced in Urdu or Persian, or, indeed, in any of the other languages we know. As a Muslim he regarded humanity as one and was deeply interested in all aspects of human activity. He reached out in all directions to gather knowledge and inspiration and has conveyed it to us in lines of immortal beauty. Iqbal for us is the gateway to world culture. His work gives us a view of the whole panorama of human civilisation and, as we read him, we find ourselves on terms of intimacy with the great minds of all ages, with whom he encourages us to agree or disagree. His broad and unbiased attitude towards all systems of thought and belief, and his universal outlook on cultures and civilisations make him undoubtedly one of the great humanists of all time.

Above all, Iqbal is the father of the Pakistan idea. He dreamt the great dream, although he did not live to see it come true. Or was it a vision of the shape of things to come, the kind of vision that comes only to the seeing eye? For Iqbal was a seer. Just as Nietzsche foretold the rise of Russia in the twentieth century and Tennyson, the development of civil aviation and of aerial warfāre and the United Nations, Iqbal had foreseen the establishment of Pakistan. As early as 1909, he had, in a letter to Ghulam Qadir Farrukh of Amritsar, rejected the idea of the so-called Hindu-Muslim unity, which he described as romantic but impracticable. In his Presidential Address to the All-India Muslim League at Allahabad on the 29th of

December 1930 he stated clearly that "self-government within the British Empire or without the British Empire, the formation of a consolidated North-West Indian Muslim State" appeared to him to be "the final destiny of the Muslims, at least of North-West India."[1] Subsequently, he included Bengal in his scheme, and reaffirmed his idea in a letter to Jinnah in 1937.[2]

Iqbal's demand for a consolidated Muslim State was met by bitter criticism some of which was aimed at him personally. He defended his views and stuck to them without entering into any personal controversy, which he never did any time in his life. It may be interesting to recall that when Iqbal was facing these acrimonious criticisms, there was no one in the subcontinent at the time to share his idea, or the blame for it, even though a number of claimants have sprung up later.

Speaking of the 1930 Address, I am reminded of a personal anecdote. When Iqbal returned to Lahore from Allahabad I went to see him. I was still a student at college and felt greatly purturbed at his reference to self-government for the new Muslim State "within the British Empire". "Why did you say that, Sir" said I; "why must our Muslim State remain the within British Empire?" His first response was a smile. "You will notice," said he, "that I have said 'self-government within or without the British Empire.' You are

1. Shamloo (ed.), *Speeches and Statements of Iqbal*, Lahore, 1948, p. 12.
2. Letter dated 21 June 1937 in *Letters of Iqbal to Jinnah*, Shaikh Muhammad Ashraf 1956, p. 24.

Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam, he put forword an ordered philosophy and pointed the way to the revitalisation of Muslim society. He has written some of the greatest poetry ever produced in Urdu or Persian, or, indeed, in any of the other languages we know. As a Muslim he regarded humanity as one and was deeply interested in all aspects of human activity. He reached out in all directions to gather knowledge and inspiration and has conveyed it to us in lines of immortal beauty. Iqbal for us is the gateway to world culture. His work gives us a view of the whole panorama of human civilisation and, as we read him, we find ourselves on terms of intimacy with the great minds of all ages, with whom he encourages us to agree or disagree. His broad and unbiased attitude towards all systems of thought and belief, and his universal outlook on cultures and civilisations make him undoubtedly one of the great humanists of all time.

Above all, Iqbal is the father of the Pakistan idea. He dreamt the great dream, although he did not live to see it come true. Or was it a vision of the shape of things to come, the kind of vision that comes only to the seeing eye? For Iqbal was a seer. Just as Nietzsche foretold the rise of Russia in the twentieth century and Tennyson, the development of civil aviation and of aerial warfāre and the United Nations, Iqbal had foreseen the establishment of Pakistan. As early as 1909, he had, in a letter to Ghulam Qadir Farrukh of Amritsar, rejected the idea of the so-called Hindu-Muslim unity, which he described as romantic but impracticable. In his Presidential Address to the All-India Muslim League at Allahabad on the 29th of

December 1930 he stated clearly that "self-government within the British Empire or without the British Empire, the formation of a consolidated North-West Indian Muslim State" appeared to him to be "the final destiny of the Muslims, at least of North-West India."[1] Subsequently, he included Bengal in his scheme, and reaffirmed his idea in a letter to Jinnah in 1937.[2]

Iqbal's demand for a consolidated Muslim State was met by bitter criticism some of which was aimed at him personally. He defended his views and stuck to them without entering into any personal controversy, which he never did any time in his life. It may be interesting to recall that when Iqbal was facing these acrimonious criticisms, there was no one in the sub-continent at the time to share his idea, or the blame for it, even though a number of claimants have sprung up later.

Speaking of the 1930 Address, I am reminded of a personal anecdote. When Iqbal returned to Lahore from Allahabad I went to see him. I was still a student at college and felt greatly purturbed at his reference to self-government for the new Muslim State "within the British Empire". "Why did you say that, Sir" said I; "why must our Muslim State remain the within British Empire?" His first response was a smile. "You will notice," said he, "that I have said 'self-government within or without the British Empire.' You are

1. Shamloo (ed.), *Speeches and Statements of Iqbal*, Lahore, 1948, p. 12.
2. Letter dated 21 June 1937 in *Letters of Iqbal to Jinnah*, Shaikh Muhammad Ashraf 1956, p. 24.

worried about 'within,' but there are so many others who have told me they are worried about 'without'."

"But why did you have to say that at all, sir?" I insisted. "Because," said he, "while I see the establishment of a Muslim State as inevitable in the process of history. I cannot see clearly, at least at present, whether it will be within or without the British Empire." I had to keep quiet. Here was a man who was utterly loyal to his vision, who told you what he saw clearly, and what he did not.

Iqbal not only foresaw Pakistan, but also the difficulties it was going to have to face from the beginning of its career. He saw the conflict and the bloodshed that was coming, and he also saw where it would mainly take place. In 1937, in a letter to Maulvi Abdul Haq of the Anjuman-i-Tarraqi-i-Urdu he wrote:

مسلمانوں کو اپنے تحفظ کے لیے جو لڑائیاں لڑنی پڑیں گی اُن کا میدان پنجاب ہوگا۔ پنجابیوں کو اس میں بڑی بڑی دقتیں پیش آئیں گی کیونکہ اسلامی زمانے میں یہاں کے مسلمانوں کی مناسب تربیت نہیں کی گئی۔ مگر اس کا کیا علاج کہ آئندہ رزم گاہ یہی سرزمین معلوم ہوتی ہے۔[1]

[The battles that the Muslims will have to fight for their self-preservation will have the Punjab as their battlefield. In this the Punjabee Muslims will have to face considerable difficulties, for during the days of Muslim rule they were not educated properly in their responsibilities. This, however, cannot be helped, for it is quite clear that this is the land where the fighting will be.]

This amazing prophecy found its initial fulfilment in the mass killings and migration of population

1. *Iqbal Namah*, Vol. II, Shaikh Muhammad Ashraf, Lahore, 1959, p. 79.

in 1947 at the time of Independence.

It has been more than fulfilled in the recent Indo-Pakistan conflict. Whether or not the prophecy has exhausted itself, we do not know.

Earlier in 1912, he had said :

آنکھ جو کچھ دیکھتی ہے لب پہ آ سکتا نہیں
محوِ حیرت ہوں کہ دنیا کیا سے کیا ہو جائے گی[1]

[The lips dare not disclose what the eye doth see ;
I am amazed at the way the world is going to change.]

He has not given us any details of what he saw, but in the very next verse he has told us which way he saw the world would go :

شب گریزاں ہوگی آخر جلوۂ خورشید سے
یہ چمن معمور ہوگا نغمۂ توحید سے[2]

[The darkness of night will flee befor the light of
the morning sun ;
This Garden will be filled with the song of the glory
of God.]

A few years later he had his greatest vision :

آنچہ بوداست و نباید زمیاں خواہد رفت
آنچہ بالیست و بنود است ہماں خواہد بود[3]

[What should not be shall cease to be—all that ever was,
What hath not been but ought to be, the same shall
come to pass.]

Iqbal similarly had a clear vision of the Kashmir struggle. Before there was any sign of agitation in Kashmir, he saw the gathering storm on the horizon. In a poem, *The Message of the East* written in Nishat Bagh in Kashmir, which is included in the *Payam-i-Mashriq*, he referred to the plight of the

1. *Bang-i-Dara*, p. 215.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 216.
3. *Payam-i-Mashriq* p : 232

common Kashmiri :

بریشم قبا خواجہ از محنت او   نصیب تنش جامۂ تارتارے[1]

[While his master wears the silken robe woven by his labour,
He himself is condemned to be in tatters.]

Iqbal goes on to call on the cup-bearer to arouse the Kashmiri's courage and inspire him to action :

سرت گردم اے ساقی ماہ سیما   بیار از نیاگان ما یادگارے
ازاں مے فشان قطرۂ بر کشیری   کہ خاکسترش آفریند شرارے[2]

[O moon-faced Saqi ! may I be thy sacrifice !
Bring me the heady wine of our ancestors.
And sprinkle some of it on the Kashmiri,
That sparks of fire may arise from his humble dust !]

Some time after this poem was written, the Kashmir agitation began. To Iqbal's own surprise, it started with a labour revolt in the silk factory to which he had referred.

Iqbal's own family came from Kashmir and he was devoted to the welfare of the downtrodden people of that land, that beautiful land which the East India Company sold away to Maharaja Gulab Singh for a mere seventy-five lacs of rupees. Early in his career, Iqbal was for years Secretary of the Kashmiri Association. He was conscious of his Kashmir origin. In a couplet which sums up his whole personality he says :

تنم گلے ز خیابان جنت کشمیر   دل از حریم حجاز و نواز شیراز است[3]

[I am a rose from the Paradise of Kashmir,
My heart comes from the sacred land of the Hijaz,
and my voice from Shiraz.]

1. *Payam-i-Mashriq*, p. 134.
2. Ibid., p. 134.
3. Ibid., p. 214.

When he recalled the East India Company's deal over Kashmir, he could not help exclaiming :

دھقان و کشت و جوے و خیابان فروختند
قومے فروختند و چہ ارزاں فروختند[1]

[Fields, streams and gardens, and peasants too, they
sold away,
They sold away a whole people and how cheaply
did they sell !]

When he thought of the misfortunes of the people of Kashmir, the unlimited potentialities they possessed and the tyranny that warped and destroyed their lives, he felt infinitely said :

آج وہ کشمیر ہے محکوم و مجبور و فقیر
کل جسے اہل نظر کہتے تھے ایران صغیر
سینۂ افلاک سے اٹھتی ہے آہ سوزناک
مردِ حق ہوتا ہے جب مرعوبِ سلطان و امیر
کہہ رہا ہے داستاں بیدردئ ایام کی
کوہ کے دامن میں وہ غم خانۂ دہقان پیر
آہ یہ قوم نجیب و چرب دست و تر دماغ
ہے کہاں روز مکافات اے خدائے دیر گیر[2]

[That Kashmir which till yesterday the discerning
ones called "Little Iran,"
Is destitute and helpless and bound in utter sub-
jugation to-day.
A sigh of grief goes up from the bosom of the
Heavens themselves,
When the simple and honest man is browbeaten
by kings and princelings,
Behold the old peasant's house of woe at the foot
of the hill ;
It tells the story of the ruthlessness of the times.

1. *Javid Namah*, p. 189.
2. *Armaghan-i-Hijaz*, pp. 258-59.

Alas ! for this people, so noble, artistic and full of invention !
Where is Thy Judgment Day, O God ! O Thou who art so slow to punish !]

But Iqbal has faith that Kashmir will not die :

جس خاک کے ضمیر میں ہے آتش چنار
ممکن نہیں کہ سرد ہو وہ خاک ارجمند[1]

[The honoured land which has the "chinar's" fire in the essence of its being,
Never will that land grow cold and lifeless.]

"What about the future ?" asks Iqbal. The answer is given in the *Javid-Namah*—"The Book of Eternity"—and is conveyed by Syed Ali Hamdani, the great saint of Kashmir, whose spirit meets Iqbal in the transcendental regions beyond the Heavens :

در نگاہش جان چو باد ارزان شود — پیش او زندان و لرزان شود
تیشۂ او خارہ را برمی درد — تا نصیب خود ز گیتی می برد[2]

[When he (the Kashmiri) comes to hold his life cheap as the wind.
The very walls of his prison-house will shake before him ;
Then his axe will split granite asunder
And he will grab his rightful share from Destiny itself !]

Here, as everywhere else, Iqbal leaves us with a message of hope.

To-day Iqbal and Pakistan are synonymous. It is significant that the recent Indian attack on Pakistan was concentrated mainly on two cities, Sialkot and Lahore, the former being the birthplace of Iqbal, and the latter the city where he lived and died. It is no less significant that during this war the people of

1. *Armaghan-i-Hijaz* p. 263
2. *Javid Namah*, p. 191.

Pakistan turned instinctively to Iqbal for inspiration and sustenance. The battle that Pakistan has had to fight for its survival has brought to the fore the whole background of its existence. Before Independence, when the Muslims were struggling for Pakistan, a number of European and American voices were heard against the Pakistan movement. The British Government were officially opposed to it and it was a refreshing exception to find a man like Beverly Nichols supporting it. Since Independence, the same kind of attitude has persisted even in well-informed and well-meaning quarters. The argument is that most of the Muslims in the subcontinent are local converts and are of the same race as the non-Muslims. The outsiders have been comparatively few, and form no more than a fraction of the total Muslim population. Thus, the race being largely the same, why should there be two countries instead of one ? I have always found it difficult to understand this argument, particularly when it emanates from European and American quarters. Let us take the Europe of to-day. According to the experts, there is a basic racial unity in that continent. "The racial characteristic of the Europe of today," says Professor Dixon of Harvard, "is the dominance of the Alpine and Palae-Alpine types. Except for portions of Southern Scandinavia, the Western Baltic lands and shores of the North Sea, the British Isles and the Iberian Peninsula, Corsica, Sardinia, Sicily and Southern Itlay, together with small areas in West Central France and South-Eastern Russia, the whole continent is dominated by brachycephalic types, which are themselves

selves central, whereas the dolichocephalic types are mainly marginal." Let us add to this the fact that the civilisation and culture of Europe as a whole has a Graeco-Roman foundation. There is also a common background of historical experience in the shape of the Roman Empire, the spread of Christianity, the Crusades, the Renaissance and the Reformation. The development of the Fine Arts also has an all-European basis. For example, even now the Russian ballet and the Russian theatre, in spite of their Communist environment, are a part of European culture. So are Goethe, Shakespeare, Dante, Voltaire, Victor Hugo, Ibsen, Dostoevsky, Tolstoy, Pasternak and even Sholokov. So too are the musicians, men like Beethoven, Mozart and Leopardi ; the artists, such as Leonardo da Vinci, Michelangelo, Rubens and Titian ; the philosophers, such as Socrates, Plato, Kant, Rousseau, Schopenhauer, Nietzsche and Bergson ; and the scientists, like Newton, Einstein, Max Planck, Madame Curie, Pavlov and Heisenberg. The Europeans have the same classics, the same Greek and Lain sources of inspiration, the same scientific outlook, the same way of living and the same approach to the basic problems of life. And yet there are more than twenty countries in Europe, which are most of the time uneasy in each other's company. Similarly, in South America, we have practically the same race and yet there are so many different countries in the area with their own political ambitions and aspirations. Even in the United States, which is pre-eminently a melting-pot of nationalities, where populations have migrated from all parts of Europe and the rest of the world

and where a new world outlook is developing, there are still a number of different cultural groups which are likely to continue for some time before they are assimilated into the American system.

The explanation for the existing multiplicity and diversity of States in the Western world may partly lie in the existence of separate linguistic groups (we may even say perhaps, in this context, the American English is different from English English, Canadian French from French French, and Swiss German from German German) even though there are, on the other hand, also some conspicuously multi-lingual States like Canada, Switzerland and the U.S.S.R. The more important reason seems to be the geographical divisions introduced by mountains and rivers and the impact of historical accident on the group consciousness of various units of population which now receive inspiration mainly from the highly emotional idea of "the glory of the Fatherland" and their military and economic superiority over other national groups which helps them to establish political hegemony over them.

We have seen how, in spite of a large measure of racial and cultural unity, the Western world is divided into so many independent States whose friendliness towards each other cannot always be taken for granted. Is there anything very strange, then, in the existence of two independent States in the Indo-Pakistan sub-continent? Let us look into the matter a little more closely.

In the first place, is it a fact, let us ask, that

Pakistan and India are racially of the same stock? Let us also ask whether the subcontinent is inhabited by one race. I am afraid that answer to both questions is in the negative. Even as far back as the Indus Valley civilisation, the answer was in the negative. The human remains discovered during the excavations at Mohenjodaro, as Sewell and Guha tell us in *Mohenjodaro and the Indus Civilisation*, edited by Sir Iohn Marshall, disclose the existence of at least four racial types, the Proto-Austroloid race, the Mediterranean race, the Mongolian branch of the Alpine stock and the Alpine race. This was the position in prehistoric times. As we all know, in course of time, many ethnic groups, such as the Aryans, the Scythians, the Kushans, the Huns and the Semitics migrated to this subcontinent, peacefully or otherwise. This racial diversity, according to Professor Dixon, lies at the root of the caste system in India. His analysis of the data available led him to the conclusion that "Caste groups do differ from each other racially, and that the social status of the caste usually bears a direct relation to the racial composition of its members."

So much for racial unity. As regards language, according to Mario Pei, author of *The Story of Language*, "India has thirty-three major tongues along with a host of minor tongues and dialects." At present there is hardly any language common to India and Pakistan except English which has been inherited from the British administration and which both countries regard as a temporary expedient. Urdu,

which developed as a result of Hindu-Muslim contact in the days of Muslim rule and which was the *lingua franca* of the larger part of the subcontinent before Independence, has been replaced in India by the highly Sanskritised Hindi, which cannot be understood by people in Pakistan. Pakistani Urdu has, on the other hand, shown a tendency to become more Persianised and Arabicised than before. Similarly, the Bengali language in East Pakistan has shown a different trend from the Bengali of West Bengal and Calcutta both in form and content. In the circumstances, if there was at any time a common linguistic factor between India and Pakistan, it is virtually no more.

The next question to consider is whether the subcontinent was at any time a political unit in the true sense of the word. Starting from about 500 B.C. which represents more or less the dawn of history in the subcontinent, we find that before the advent of the Muslims, the subcontinent, as a whole, was hardly ever consolidated into a single political and administrative unit except, perhaps, for a few years under Asoka. With the Muslim conquest, the larger part of the subcontinent was brought under centralized control and during the reign of Alauddin Khalji in the fourteenth century, Malik Kafur, the famous general, also subdued almost the entire region of South India. Subsequently disintegration set in and it was not till the Mughals came to power that India was again ruled by a strong hand at the centre. After the death of Aurangzeb in 1707, the Provincial Governors gradually became independent, even

though some semblance of allegiance to the Mughal throne was maintained for some time in certain cases. In any case, the sub-continent was far from being politically united when the British took over. Indeed, the lack of political unity was one of the main reasons for the success of the new rulers. The British, who ruled the larger part of the subcontinent for two hundred years and the whole of it for a century, consolidated the administration of the sub-continent with the help of roads, railways, posts and telegraphs and improved inland water transport. Towards the end, air communications were also established within the country. Incidentally, Burma was also a part of British India until it was separated from India in 1937, ten years before the sub-continent itself was partitioned. Burma had never been part of India, and its inclusion in the British Indian dominions gave the whole British administration an artificial complexion. Moreover, the British were always regarded as foreign rulers and their consolidation of the subcontinent was based on considerations of their own administrative convenience rather than any process of inner political evolution. The consolidation did not grow from within; it was imposed from without. Nevertheless, when in the latter half of the nineteenth century the British Government began to think of devolution of political power to the people of the country and constitution reforms began by instalments. The Hindu intellectuals of the time were quick to take advantage of the British consolidation of the subcontinent. Having come into contact with European ideas of nationalism and

democracy, these politically conscious intellectuals who were the main force behind the newly-formed Indian National Congress, which the British Indian Government under Lord Dufferin had themselves promoted and fostered, saw a rare opportunity before them, and in the name of democratic freedom began to claim India for the majority community, which was no other than themselves. What they overlooked was the fact that the terms "majority" and "minority" can legitimately be applied to political groups under the democratic system only when the population is otherwise homogeneous. The Muslims, who regarded themselves as a distinct and separate people, therefore, did not take kindly to this orthodox but impracticable view of the future Indian democracy. As the British Government desired to associate the people with the administration in increasing measure, particularly in the shape of the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms of 1919 and the establishment of Provincial Autonomy in 1937, the scramble for power and position in the political and administrative set-up of the country became more bitter and the relations between the Hindus and the Muslims deteriorated progressively. Communal riots became so common that the period from 1913 onwards, with a brief interval for the Lucknow Pact and the Non-Co-operation Movement of 1921, can best be described as one of continued civil war. The Simon Commission counted 112 major communal riots in the subcontinent in the five years 1923-1927 only. The subsequent period was, if anything, worse than this. Under these conditions the Muslim politicians,

who had been active since the foundation of the All-India Muslim League at Dacca in 1906, concentrated their attention on devising safeguards for their people against the dominance of the Hindu majority in a democratic India. The Minto-Morley Reforms of 1909 had conceded separate electorates to Muslims but this was only the beginning of the solution.

Subsequent events were, however, not encouraging. The Partition of Bengal in 1905, which Lord Curzon undertook as an administrative measure, and the consequent establishment of a new province of Eastern Bengal and Assam, which incidentally was a province with a Muslim majority, was violently opposed by the Hindus. Its annulment, which was announced by King George V at the Delhi Durbar of 1911, was an occasion for deep frustration for the Muslims and great jubilation for the Hindus. Notwithstanding these adverse developments, Muhammad Ali Jinnah, who at the time was President of the All-India Muslim League, though still an ardent Indian nationalist, negotiated the Lucknow Pact with the Indian National Congress. The Pact confirmed and extended the principle of separate electorates for the Muslims in the Central and Provincial Legislatures with reservation of seats but this could be achieved only at the expense of their majority in the crucial provinces of the Punjab and Bengal. The Muslims regarded this as too high a price to pay as the Pact gave them no effective voice either in the minority provinces or in the Punjab and Bengal where they were in a mjority. The atmosphere of goodwill built up by the Pact was short-lived and

there was a renewal of communal tension after the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms of 1919 transferred power to the elected representatives of the people. The Non-Co-operation Movement, which brought the Hindus and the Muslims nearer each other than at any time before and as a result of which the Hindus, under the leadership of Gandhiji, all but succeeded in destroying the Muslims as a political entity, was followed by the severely communal movements of *Shuddhi* and *Sanghtan*, which aimed at the wholesale conversion of the Muslims or their expulsion from the sub-continent, and the Muslim reaction in the form of the *Tabligh* and *Tanzim* movements which sought to promote Muslim missionary activity and the political solidarity of the Muslim community. It is significant that the leaders of both these movements were some of the former leaders of Hindu-Muslim unity, namely, Mr. Shardhanand, Dr. Moonje and Pandit Malaviya on the one hand and Dr. Saifuddin Kitchlew on the other. The foundation of the aggressive anti-Muslim Rashtriya Sewak Sangh in 1925 and the increase in the activities of the militant All-India Hindu Mahasabha increased the fears of the Muslims still further. There were numerous attempts by Muslim leaders, including Jinnah's famous "Fourteen Points," to arrive at some solution which may provide satisfactory safeguards to the Muslim community. No such solution was forthcoming, as none was acceptable to the Hindus.

The Nehru Report, which represented the thinking of the Hindu dominated Nehru Committee about

the future constitution of the subcontinent recommended a unitary form of Government and repudiated the principles of separate electorates and weightage for the Muslims in the provinces in which they were in a minority.This Report was followed by the publication of the Report of the Simon Commission which represented British thinking about future Constitutional Reforms. From the Muslims point of view, this Report also went against them, particularly on the issues of their adequate representation in the Punjab and Bengal Assemblies, and raising the status of the Frontier and Baluchistan Provinces. The Report was followed by two Round Table Conferences in London, to which political leaders from the subcontinent were invited and asked to agree on a scheme for the future, particularly on the issue of representation for various communities. No settlement, however, was reached at these Conferences, with the result that the British Prime Minister, Ramsay Macdonald, had to give his own Award on the issue. The Award, while conceding the continuance of separate electorates, maintained the previous position in regard to the majority provinces of the Punjab and Bengal where the Muslim majority was not allowed to be reflected in the legislature. All this added to the disappointment of the Muslims.

In the rapidly changing world around them, the Muslims, who were poorer and less educated than the Hindus and had little influence in the administration, were preoccupied with the idea of preserving themselves as a political and social entity in the

subcontinent. They could not, however think of anything except the somewhat negative approach implied in the demand for safeguards. This led them nowhere, and their frustration increased. It was left to Iqbal to realize that the Muslims needed a State of their own in order to be able to live their life as a people in their own way. This now seems to us to have been the obvious solution, but, strange as it may seem, it appeared as a revolutionary idea at the time.

It is hardly possible to understand the political struggle without taking note of two factors which are of basic importance—the economic position of the Muslims and their status as a distinct and separate cultural entity. I have delt with the subject at length elsewhere, and would content myself with a brief resume of the position on the present occasion. Let us take up the economic factor first. The Muslims ruled the subcontinent for more than a thousand years and while their administration was moderate and considerate (had it been otherwise, it could not have continued for a thousand years), their own position as rulers was one of undisputed advantage. They had hardly any economic problem to worry about. When, however, their political power declined and the East India Company supplanted them as rulers, they suffered loss of wealth and social status along with their political position. The British, who had taken power from them had no particular reason to trust them. On the contrary, they began to take early steps to make sure that the Muslims

were reduced to a position of helplessness. In Bengal, for instance, after Lord Clive took the Diwani from Emperor Shah Alam in 1765, the Muslims, who held a majority of posts in Revenue and Judicial Departments and in the Military, lost these avenues of employment. Again, their educational system suffered from the resumption by the East India Company of the grants given by Muslim kings and nobles to Muslim educational institutions. In 1793, Lord Cornwallis, the Governor-General of India, introduced the Permanent Settlement of Bengal which, in the words of James O'Kinealy, "elevated the Hindu Collectors, who up to that time had but unimportant posts, to the position of landlords, gave them a proprietary right in the soil, and allowed them to accumulate wealth which would have gone to the Muslims under their own rule." On the other hand, the old Muslim Zamindars, formerly the lords of all they surveyed, were reduced to poverty and destitution. Sir William Hunter has given us a picture of the misfortune that had overtaken the once powerful Muslim community in India. In 1837, when Persian was replaced by English in the Company's offices, the prospects of employment for Muslims diminished still further. The British policy was to cultivate and trust the Hindu and to leave the Muslim to his fate. Lord Ellenborough as Governor-General wrote to the Duke of Wellington in 1842, urging patronage of the Hindus who, according to him, were nine-tenths of the population, rather than trying to appease the Muslims, who were only one-

tenth and could not be reconciled to the British power. "It seems to me most unwise," said he, "when we are sure of the hostility of one-tenth, not to secure the enthusiastic support of the nine-tenths which are faithful." The events of 1857 made the Muslim position still worse. Notwithstanding the fact that the Hindus and the Muslims were jointly responsible for the rebellion and the first mutineer, Mangal Panday, whose name became a generic appellation for all mutineers, was a Hindu, the British thought the Muslims were at the root of the trouble. "Tell these rascally Musalmans," said Lieutenant Roberts (later Field Marshal Lord Roberts), "that by the Grace of God we shall still be masters of India." This kind of feeling led to further persecution of these Muslims. In 1871, after the Crown had taken over the administration, a survey of employment conducted by E. C. Bailey, a Secretary to the Government, was summed up by him by saying that there was scarcely a Government office in Calcutta at that time in which a Muslim could hope for "any post above the rank of porter, messenger, filler of ink-pots and mender of pens." The educational movement of Syed Ahmad Khan aroused the Muslims to a sense of their degradation as a community and helped them to some extent to participate in Government administration and economic activity. The Hindus, however, were so far ahead in the race that there was no hope of catching up with them in the ordinary way. On the other hand, the Muslims were growing in population and poverty. From about 18 million in 1850 or thereabouts, they had grown to about

50 million by the turn of the century. In a famous speech in 1907, Iqbal has described the abject poverty of the Muslim people. As time went on there was some improvement in the position, particularly after the British Government had agreed to a reservation of posts in the services for Muslims. The relative position of the Hindus and the Muslims, however, continued to be that of "haves" and "have-nots" down to the Partition. The economic disparity between the two peoples, the almost complete absence of industries in the Pakistan areas (which was hardly noted by any European observer except Professor Coupland) and the lack of any prospects of economic well-being among the Muslims in the face of the Hindu monopoly of the economy was one of the major contributory factors in the demand for Partition. On the 23rd of March, 1940, the Muslim League adopted the Pakistan Resolution at its Lahore Session, and thenceforward Pakistan became the accepted goal of the Muslims of the subcontinent. Nevertheless, in 1946, the Muslims, in the interest of peaceful political evolution, agreed, under Jinnah's leadership, to accept the Cabinet Mission Plan which envisaged an undivided India with a Group System which would have allowed some freedom for economic development for the Pakistan areas in the Indus and the Ganges-Brahmaputra basins. It was, however, precisely this feature of the Plan which provoked Hindu opposition. The Plan, therefore, did not go forward. It was the last of an innumerable series of attempts to find a solution to the Hindu-Muslim

problem in an undivided India. It failed because the Hindus failed to inspire any confidence among the Muslims and, indeed, succeeded only in giving the impression that they wanted to damage, if not altogether destroy, the political, cultural and economic position of the Muslim community. The outbreaks of communal violence against the Muslims culminating in the Bihar tragedy of 1946 did nothing to allay these fears. There was no question any more of the Hindus and the Muslims living together ; they had to part and part they did.

More important than the economic aspect of the Hindu-Muslim relationship is the cultural aspect. Indeed, it is the most fundamental line of cleavage between the Hindus and the Muslims. In order to understand the significance of this cleavage, it is necessary to bear in mind the revolutionary impact of the Islamic movement on men and peoples. Those who accept Islam have their whole personality transformed, with a clear break with the past and a complete change of direction. Islam, with its distinct moral values and approach to the problems of life, binds its adherents into a compact ideological community. History gives us more than one example of a people who started their career by a campaign of destruction against Muslim countries and Muslim culture and ended up by becoming devout adherents of Islam. The Saljuqs and the Mongols are two such examples. "Just as in the case of the Saljuqs," says Professor Hitti, speaking of the Il-Khans, "the religion of the Moslems had conquered where their

arms had failed, less than half a century of Hulagu's merciless attempt at the destruction of Islamic culture, his great-grandson Ghazan, as a devout Moslem, was consecrating much time and energy to the revivification of that same culture."

The fact that a large number of Muslims in Pakistan and the rest of the sub-continent are descendants of Hindu converts to Islam is irrelevant, for once a man becomes a Muslim, his whole outlook on life becomes different. His loyalty and allegiance and his whole attitude to life and the universe—in a word, his *Weltanschauung*—is completely changed. As an example of the dynamic impact of Islam, we may mention Iqbal himself, who was a Kashmiri Brahmin of the Sapru caste by origin and who has become the greatest exponent of Muslim thought in modern times.

The problem of culture in the subcontinent is not as simple as it is sometimes made out to be. In the course of a thousand years of Muslim rule contacts developed between the ruler and the ruled, particularly after the first five centuries of Turkish sway, and a semblance of a common culture emerged. This culture, which was shared by the upper strata of Hindu and Muslim society, had inevitably a Muslim bias. It was based on Persian language and literature, in which both Hindus and Muslims acquired proficiency and produced poets, writers and scholars of eminence. We have, for example, Tekchand Bahar, the great lexicographer of the Persian language, and Chandar Bhan Brahman, the

famous poet, and a whole host of Hindu scholars of Persian. The Mughal school of painting produced some outstanding Hindu artists like Manohar and Bachitter, while the old classical Hindu music was supplemented and improved by eminent Muslims like Amir Khusro, Sultan Husain Sharqi and Mian Tan Sen. Again, the Bhakti movement with it emphasis on monotheism was a product of Islam's impact on Hinduism, and produced such great men as Guru Nanak, Kabir and Chaitanya. Social contacts in the upper layers of Hindu and Muslims society were frequent and intimate, culminating in Akbar's marriages with a number of Hindu princesses and similar other matrimonial alliances. The Hindus filled a large number of civil and military offices, including some of the highest. Todar Mal Khatri, who was the Revenue Minister of Sher Shah Suri before he become Imperial Chancellor under Akbar, Hemu the grocer, the Commander-in chief of the Suri forces at the Second Battle of Panipat, and Man Singh, one of the highest ranking generals of the Mughal Army, are three out of many examples. The judicial system aimed at even-handed justice to the Hindus and the Muslims alike. Kings and Emperors were personally accessible to anyone who cared to knock at their door for justice. Trade and industry was largely in the hands of the Hindus, who were free to exercise their religion. In the lower strata of society, they were free even to maintain, as they did, a social boycott of the Muslims throughout the period of Muslim rule. The Muslim rulers had

settled down in the country and had severed their connections with their ancestral territories of origin, but the Hindus never really accepted them as their own. They were still *Malechas*, the low and the impure, or *Jabans*, the hateful foreigners, as Bankim Chatterjee calls them.

The Muslim rulers generally maintained an atmosphere of peace and tranquillity which encouraged friendly relations between the Hindus and the Muslims. It must be admitted, however, that as was inevitable, the relationship between the ruler and the ruled was not always balanced one. Moreover, there is no doubt that with all the concessions they enjoyed, the Hindus were a subject people. The relationship between a ruling people and a ruled population can never be a healthy one and is bound to leave a trail of bittterness behind it. You cannot expect gratitude from the people you rule. It was hardly surprising, therefore, to find that as soon as the Muslim power declined and the British established their authority over the subcontinent, the Hindus lost no time in turning their back on their former rulers and in ingratiating themselves with the new power in the land. Soon the last vestiges of the old Hindu-Muslim-culture disappeared. The Urdu language which has a foundation of Sanskrit and a super structure of Persian and which developed as a result of Hindu-Muslim contact under Muslim rule, is a particular case in point. Some of the great poets and writers of this language have been Hindus like Daya Shankar Nasim, author of the classic poem

Gulzar-i-Nasim or *Gul Bakavali*; Rattan Nath Sarshar, author of another classic, th prose romance of the *Fasana-i-Azad*, and a number of other well-known works; Prem Chand, the greatest short-story writer of the language; Ufaq Lakhnavi; Barq Dehlavi and Naubat Rai Nazar Lakhnavi, all front-rank poets and writers; Brij Narain Chakbast Lakhnavi, an outstanding poet, writer and critic; Lala Sri Ram, author of the monumental *Khumkhana-i-Javid*, the best known biographical dictionary of Urdu poets and writers; Pyare Lal Ashob, a pioneer of the Urdu language in the Punjab; Ram Babu Saksena, author of the best known history of Urdu literature; Daya Narain Nigam, editor of one of the foremost Urdu literary magazines, the *Zamanah*; Suraj Narain Mihr, one of the best known writers of children's poems; Trilok Chand Mahrum and Babhu Ram Josh Malsiani, both poets of high rank (the latter an authority on the Urdu language); Durga Sahai Sarur, a leader of the transition from the neo-classical to the to modern Urdu school of poetry; Professor Firaq Gorakhpuri, an outstanding exponent of the new *ghazal*; Anand Narain Mulla, a polished and versatile poet and writer; Pandit Brij Mohan Dattatrya Kaifi, a famous scholar, poet and writer; and a number of others. Even in our own generation, we have had men of the stature of Hari Chand Akhtar, a master of the Urdu ghazal, Rajinder Singh Bedi and Balwant Singh, two of the best short-story writers of Urdu, Arsh Malsiani, Jagan Nath Azad, Dawarka Dass Shula and Munawwar Lakhnavi, who

rank with the best poets of their generation, Malik Ram, a scholar of great eminence and an authority on Ghalib, and a great many others. Indeed, no account of Urdu language and literature would be worth the paper it is written on if the Hindu contributions were to be omitted from it. And yet Urdu became an early victim of the Hindu hostility towards the Muslims. The Hindus began to promote Hindi as against Urdu and some of the most acrimonious controversies of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries centered round the Urdu-Hindi problem. Indeed, the French scholar, Garcin de Tassey, was moved by these controversies to remark that the Hindu wanted to do away with everything that reminded them of Muslim rule.

In the new environment in which the two communities found themselves under the British Raj, with the old common culture disappearing, both the Hindus and the Muslims were thrown back on themselves, and there was a revival of culture on both sides. When they were not concentrating on their own culture, the Hindus and the Muslims could live together in an atmosphere of social and cultural amity, but with the revival of Hindu and Muslim culture which took place in the latter half of the eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth century, the differences were seen to be obvious and fundamental. Let us take the Hindu and Muslim views on some of the important problems of life. The Hindu view of the Ultimate Reality is flexible, while the Muslim view is not. You may believe in one

God or in a million gods or no god at all and yet you can be a Hindu. A Muslim, however, can remain a Muslim only if he believes in one God and one alone. Let us take the influence of the incidence of birth on the social status of the human individual. A Hindu is expected to be loyal to the caste in which he is born. If he is a Shudra, he has to be a good Shudra. He should perform all the duties of a Shudra and not aspire any higher. As Ambedkar tells us, a Shudra is not expected to aspire even to listening to the sacred Vedas; if he does, he may have molten lead poured into his ears. Good conduct may enable him to be born in a higher caste in the next life. On the other hand, a bad Shudra may descend to the body of a lower animal when born again. Islam, on the other hand, recognises no caste system. A man may be born in any station in life; he is entitled to rise to the highest rung of the social ladder on his merits. The Slave Kings of India and the Mamlukes of Egypt are remarkable examples of men born in slavery or descended from slaves rising to the highest positions of power. Again, coming to habits of eating and drinking, the Hindus and the Muslims do not eat or drink together, except when they have been Europeanised beyound redemption. A good Hindu would not let a Muslim touch his glass or his eating untensils. Again, rightly or wrongly, the Muslim is fond of eating the cow and, rightly or wrongly, the Hindu regards it as a sacred animal entitled to protection. The Hindu loves music, which forms an integral

part of his devotional activities. The Muslim may like music, but would not like to mix it with prayers. That is why we have had so much bloodshed over cow-slaughter and music before mosques. In the field of literature, the Hindu sources of inspiration lie largely in Sanskrit and its dialects, while the Muslim turns to Persian and Arabic. Mario Pei makes an acute observation when he points out that Gandhi, the Hindu leader, derived his title of "Mahatma" from Sanskrit, while Jinnah, the leader of the Muslims, had his popular name of "Quaid-i-Azam" from Arabic. Before Independence, the Indian National Congress adopted "Bande Mataram" as the national song of India, without regard to the fact that this song, which occurs in Bankim Chandar Chatterjee's *Anando Moth*, is written as a battle-cry against the foreigners, including the Muslims. Added to all this is the fact that the process of history which forms the main explanation of the separate existence of so many States in the Western world, has produced persons in the sub-continent in the course of a thousand years or so of Muslim rule who have come to be regarded as heroes by the Muslims and villains by the Hindus and *vice versa*. Shivaji and Aurangzeb are two well-known examples. Their quarrel was political, but in the nineteenth century, the Hindu nationalists gave it a deeply communal colour and made Shivaji a national hero of the Hindus. To this the Muslims reacted by making Aurangzeb a hero of Islam.

The relationship between the Hindus and the

Muslims at the beginning of the twentieth century is illustrated by an anecdote related by Sir Walter Lawrence in his book *The India We Served.* "Sir Partab (the Maharaja of Idar)," says Sir Walter, "had come up to Simla to be present at a farewell dinner Lord Curzon gave to my wife and myself the night before we left, and after the dinner Sir Partab and I sat up till 2 o'clock in the morning talking of his hopes and ambitions. One of his ambitions was to annihilate the Muslim people in India. I deprecated this prejudice and mentioned Muslim friends common to both of us. 'Yes,' he said, 'I like them too, but very much like them dead.' "

It is sometimes suggested that the subcontinent forms one geographical unit. While it is true that the sea and the Himalayas provide a geographical boundary, the inherent geographical unity of the subcontinent is far from obvious. Indeed, it would appear that the area south of the Vindhiachals which is technically a peninsula, with its separate physiography, terrain and climate, has hardly any connection with the rest of the subcontinent. In the same way, the Indus basin and the Ganges-Brahmaputra basin, which broadly respresent West and East Pakistan respectively, are self-contained geographical (and economic) units, distinct from all others. Similarly, Rajputana is a separate arid zone. The diversity in natural geography in the subcontinent has resulted in a variety of climate, with a variety of related features, such as fauna and flora. As a matter of interest, the subcontinent has areas of the heaviest

and the lowest rainfalls in the world, namely Cherapunji and the desert areas around Khairpur, respectively. Similarly, we have in the subcontinent what has so far been regarded as the hottest place on earth, namely Jacobabad, while, at the same time, we have some extremely cold places in the Himalayan regions. In the circumstances, it must take a great deal of courage on the part of anyone to assert the geographical unity of the subcontinent. Speaking of geographical units, would it not be correct to say that North Ireland and Eire are one unit, and Canada and U.S.A., excluding certain extremely situated areas, another unit ?

Again, it has been said that the separation of East and West Pakistan by a thousand miles of Indian territory makes Pakistan an unusual geographical phenomenon. At first sight this may appear to be so, but a little reflection would place this phenomenon at least on the same footing as the U.S.A. and Alaska, not to mention Hawaii.

Let us try to sum up. We have seen that there is no racial or linguistic unity between India and Pakistan. We have also seen that the revival of Muslim culture on the one hand and of Hindu culture on the other has disclosed the existence of an unbridgeable gulf between the Hindus and the Muslims. With cultural outlooks so divergent, it is impossible to think that the two peoples would be prepared to live together and devote their combined efforts to a joint purpose. We have also seen the growth of economic disparity between the Hindus and the Muslims under British rule, a disparity which could

not have been remedied in an undivided India with the Hindus holding a monopoly of economic power. We have also had a glimpse of the political process which caused ceaseless controversy and growing bitterness between the two peoples. We have also seen that the subcontinent was never really a political unit (nor is it a geographical unit). Whatever political unity was achieved from time to time was imposed from without by strong and alien rulers.

Our study of the past makes it clear that history charted different courses for the Hindus and the Muslims in the subcontinent. It could not have been otherwise. There was hardly anything in commc between them. The question before the Muslims was whether they should live as a free and independent people, preserving their religion and their culture for themselves, or should they let themselves be merged into the caste system of Hindu India, with its inhuman limitations. But Islam is too vital a force to suffer such a fate. The result, therefore, was the partition of the subcontinent. This was inevitable. There were historical forces working themselves to their logical conclusion. The Hindus, with rare exceptions like G.K. Gokhale and C.R. Das, did not understand these forces, and were, therefore, not amenable to the obvious solution until it was wrested from their hands. The Muslims, on the other hand, were fortunate enough to produce a seer—call him a visionary if you will—who could discern the inner process of history behind the outward events, and give voice to the latent aspirations of the Muslims

in clear and unambiguous terms. Pakistan represents the struggle of Muslim culture to Survive in this part of the world. "The construction of a polity on national lines," said he, "if it means the displacement of the Islamic principle of solidarity is simply unthinkable to a Muslim."[1] He demanded the formation of a consolidated Muslim State in the best interests of Islam and India. That for him, was the only way to peace in the subcontinent, provided, of course, that the Hindus showed understanding of the position. Let us hope that, in spite of all that has happened, a proper understanding of the meaning of Pakistan will dawn on those who are still somewhat confused about it. It is only through such an understanding on the part of the Indian rulers and the world at large that a permanent solution can be found of the problems of the Indo-Pakistan subcontinent.

Published in "Iqbal Review" April 1966.

1. Shamloo (ed) op. cit., p. 9.

Iqbal Exhibition Welcome Address

On the occasion of Iqbal Day at Karachi on April 16, 1966 an exhibition of material on Iqbal was also arranged. It was inaugurated by H. E. Mr. Hoshang Ansari. Ambassador of the Royal Iranian Embassy in Karachi. Mr. Mumtaz Hasan, Managing Director, National Bank of Pakistan and Chairman Iqbal Day Organising Committee delivered the following speech of welcome.

Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen.

IT is my privilege and pleasure to welcome you all to this Iqbal Exhibition. I am particularly happy that it has been possible for His Excellency the Imperial Iranian Ambassador to be with us this afternoon to inaugurate the exhibition. Iran and Pakistan have been close to each other over the centuries. Our political relationship is inherent in the physical contiguity of our two countries, apart from the fact that towards the close of the sixth century B.C. Sind and the Eastern Punjab were a part of the Achaemenid empire. This as the Greek historian Herodotus tells us, was the twentieth strapy, and had its capital at Taxila. The cultural affinity, which is always deeper and mere lasting than political connections, has been particularly prominent since the Middle Ages when Persian become the court language of Muslim rule in this

subcontinent, and mean of such eminence as Masood Saad Salman, Amir Khusro, Ziauddin Burney, Abdur Rahim, Khankhanan, Faizee, Abul Fazl, Abdul Qadir Bedil and Asadullah Khan Ghalib rose among us. There were also the Persian poets and scholars, large in number, who were attracted by the munificent patronage of the Muslim rulers of the subcontinent, and spent the best part of their lives with us. We had men like Urfi of Shiraz, Naziri of Nashapur, Talib of Amul Kalim of Kashan, Mir Zahid of Herat and others. Persian became such a vital part of our literary tradition and our cultural heritage that the educated classes used it not only in their official dealings but also in their private correspondence. Thousands of books on literary, academic and scientific subjects were written in Persian. The role of the language in the cultural life of the subcontinent is illustrated particularly in the works of Ghalib and Iqbal. Ghalib, who is one of the greatest poets of the Urdu language which itself represents a blend of Persian and Sanskrit, gave preference to his Persian poetry over his Urdu Diwan :

پارسی بین تابہ بینی نقش ہاے رنگ رنگ
بگذر از مجموعۂ اردو کہ بی رنگ من است

If you want images of variegated hue,
See my Persian poems,
And leave aside my Urdu work,
For that is lacking in colour.

With the advent of British rule the English language rose to prominence, and Persian language and literature gradually lost favour. There were a

few scholars and poets who adhered to the old tradition, but it was not till Mohammad Iqbal turned to Persian that we were able to re-establish our spiritual and cultural links with Iran, and, indeed, with the rest of the Muslim world. Iqbal started as a poet of Urdu, and is, like Ghalib, one of the greatest names in Urdu poetry, but when he developed his world-view and felt that he had a message to deliver, he decided to use Perian as his vehicle of communication. His message was intended not only for the Muslim world but for the human race as a whole. It was his feeling, however, that of all the languages he knew he could express himself best in Persian :

گرچه هندی در عذوبت شکر است طرز گفتار دری شیرین تر است
فکر من از جلوه اش مسحور است خامهٔ من شاخ نخل طور گشت
پارسی از رفعت اندیشه ام در خورد با فطرت اندیشه ام

Although the language of Hind is sweet as sugar,
Yet sweeter is the fashion of Persian speech ;
My mind was enchanted by its loveliness,
My pen became as a twig of the Burning Bush,
Because of the loftiness of my thoughts,
Persian alone is suitable to them.

In another verse Iqbal has summed up the importance of Iran in the whole complexion of his thought :

تنم گلے ز خیابان جنت کشمیر
دل از حریم حجاز و نوا ز شیرازست

My body is a rose from the earthly Paradise of Kashmir,
My heart belongs to the Holy Land of the Hijaz, and my song is from Shiraz,

It may be recalled that Iqbal's thesis for his Doctorate from the Munich University concerned the 'Development of Metaphysics in Persia'. He was

proud of the fact that, though a Brahmin by extraction he knew the great teachings of Rumi and Shams Tabriz :

مرا بنگر در ہندوستان دیگر نمی بینی
برہمن زادۂ رمز آشنائے روم تبریزاست

Mark me, for there is none besides in Hindustan,
Who, though a Brahmin's son, is familiar with the mysteries of Room and Tabriz.

As regards Iran, his feelings can best be expressed in his own words :

چوں چراغ لالہ سوزم در خیابان شما
اے جوانان عجم جان من و جان شما

I burn like the lamp of the tulip in your garden ;
My life is yours, O brave men of Iran.

If Iqbal loved Iran, Iran has shown no lack of affection for Iqbal. One of the warmest tributes ever paid to him came from that Prince of Poets, the late Malik-ush-Shuara Bahar, who wrote in 1942 :

عصر حاضر خاصۂ اقبال گشت   واحدے کز صد ہزاران بر گزشت
شاعران گشتند جیشے تارومار   وین بہادر کرد کار صد سوار

The modern age has become the age of Iqbal,
He is one who has surpassed thousands of others.
When poets were like a beaten and disorganised band,
This mighty warrior, single-handed, did the work of a hundred men.

This was long before the establishment of Pakistan. Since independence, Iqbal has become still better known in Iran. The late Sadiq Sarmad said of him :

اگرچہ مرد بمیرد ز گردش مہ و سال
نمردہ است و نمیرد محمد اقبال

Although men are destined to die in the course of months and years,
Muhammad Iqbal has not died, and shall never die.

This is only an example of the tributes that present day Iran has paid to Iqbal. Recently, a complete collection of his Persian works has been published in Tehran.

This a subject to which one cannot do justice in a short time, but I have taken the liberty to refer to it in order to tell Your Excellency how very pleased and honoured we feel that you, the Ambassador of Iran in Pakistan, should inaugurate an exhibition of Iqbal.

So far as I know, this is the fourth Iqbal exhibition even held. The first exhibition, I am informed, was held in Hyderabad Deccan in 1946. The second was held in Karachi, after independence, which was opened by Her Highness the begum of Janjira here in Frere Hall in the very place where it is being held today. The third, and a much smaller one was arranged privately, again in this very place. on the occasion of the visit to Pakistan of Mr. Jarring. who had come to this country as a representative of the Security Council. This is the fourth exhibition. As you will see, we have tried, on this occasion, to assemble Iqbal's autographs, letters and other writings, in original, together with a number of rare books, photographs, paintings. There are also first editions of most of his books and a number of important publications dealing with his life and work. The object of a collection such as this is to bring Iqbal closer to us and to enable those who did not or could not know him personally to see him in his original work. It would be possible to assemble a much bigger collection, but the sponsors of the

present exhibition have aimed at a representative though not a comprehensive collection.

May I be allowed to mention that there is also a stall in this exhibition at which books by Iqbal and on him are on sale to the public.

Before I close, I would like to extend our heartiest welcome to all our guests, particularly those who have taken the trouble to come to Karachi specially for this occasion.

We are proud to have Ali Bakhsh with us today. This is the man who served Iqbal for a life time, and has been serving him even after his death. In spite of his ninety years, he has done us the honour of travelling to Karachi for this Iqbal Day function. We cannot forget his kindness. May he live long!

We have also with us here such eminent scholars as Allama Arshi, Syed Nazir Niazi, Dr. Abdullah Chughtai, Sufi Ghulam Mustafa Tabassum, and Sayyid Abid Ali Abid, all of whom knew Iqbal and can speak about him with authority.

In the end, may I express our gratitude to Your Excellency once again and request you to do us the honour of inaugurating the Iqbal Exhibition.

The Source of Iqbal's inspiration

IQBAL owed to Iran his artistic inspiration and a great deal of his development as a thinker. He was a profound scholar of Persian language and literature and adopted Persian as the medium of expression for some of his most important works.

Iqbal was born in 1877. By this time Persian, which had been the official language of Muslim rule in the subcontinent for nearly a thousand years, had been replaced by English but it continued to be the language of culture among the Muslims and to a large extent even among the non-Muslims.

The Urdu language, which by that time had become the *lingua franca* of the greater part of the subcontinent and the language of the lower courts and the lower echelons of the administration, contained a large proportion of Persian words and phrases. The proportion was so large indeed that it would be difficult to think of Urdu without Persian.

Persian was a subject still taught in schools and colleges set up and patronised by the British regime, although it could no longer serve as a means of securing employment in the administration as had been the case under Muslim rule.

The British attitude towards Persian was determined by their general antipathy towards the Muslims, particularly under the East India Company, and their

desire to destroy the cultural cohesion of the Muslim community, which depended on Arabic and Persian. This was at the back of Lord Macaulay's mind when he wrote his famous Minute on Education. Persian was therefore eliminated from the administration and ceased to be a source of economic benefit. The British did not however, wish to destroy Persian or Arabic as such. Indeed, at this time, they themselves produced scholars of the eminence of Sir William Jones and others whose contribution to Arabic and Persian studies should be a matter of pride to anyone.

Iqbal was sent to a "Maktab" to start with. There he learnt the Quran and the rudiments of Persian and Arabic. As he grew up he, came under the influence of Maulvi Syed Mir Hasan, who kindled in him a love of Arabic and Persian and of Muslim culture. Mir Hasan is one of the two most important teachers of Iqbal, the other being Sir Thomas Arnold who again, was a scholar of Arabic and Persian and a well known author on Muslim history and culture. Persian and Arabic thus formed the foundation of Iqbal's education.

After studying at Sialkot, his birth place, Iqbal came to the Government College, Lahore and met Arnold, who advised him to go Europe for higher studies Iqbal left Lahore in 1905 and spent the next three years at the universities of Munich and Heidelberg in Germany, and Cambridge and London in England. He chose the "Development of Metaphysics in Persian" as the subject of his doctoral thesis and was awarded a Ph.D. for it by the Munich University. Incidentally the "Lebenslauf" or bio-data he wrote

for his thesis has been found to be the most authentic source for determining Iqbal's date of birth.

The "Development of Metaphysics in Persia" was the first book of its kind; and although Iqbal himself subsequently modified some of his earlier conclusions as stated in this thesis, it still remains the starting point of research on the subject.

As a poet, Iqbal was famous even before he proceeded to Europe, but he wrote in Urdu. It was during his stay in Europe, as Abdul Qadir tells us, that he made his debut in Persian poetry. During this period he had an opportunity of studying the various aspect of European civilisation and culture and the workings of modern.

Nationalism and the modern European national state at first hand. The experience made him turn away from his earlier nationalistic attitude towards Indian politics and he was attracted more and more by the broad humanistic outlook of Islam. This revolutionised his whole thinking. He came to feel that he had a message to give to mankind for which, Urdu his pervious poetic medium would be inadequate.

He said so in two of the verses of the Asrar-i-Khudi (Secrets of the self).

گرچہ ہندی در عذو بت شکر است
طرز گفتار دری شیریں تر است
فارسی با رفعت اندیشہ ام
در خورد با فکرت اندیشہ ام

Although the language of Hind is sweet as sugar;
Yet sweeter is the fashion of Persian speech;

Because of the loftiness of my thoughts ;
Persian alone is suitable to them (Nicholson).

The *Asrar-i-Khudi* published in 1915, was his first great poem in Persian. It was written in the metre of the Mathnavi of Rumi, and even though primarily of philosophical impart its poetic quality transcended and overshadowed the subject matter. The Asrar was followed two years later by the *Rumuz-i-Bekhudi* (The Mysteries of Selflessness).

These two poems taken together from the basis of Iqbal's teaching, which may, at the risk of over-simplification, be stated as the education, development and discipline of the Self and dedication of its potentialities to the highest social purpose and for the benefit of humanity as a whole.

The *Asrar* and *Rumuz* were followed by the *Payam-i-Mashriq* (The Message of the East), which was also in Persian and is regarded by many of Iqbal's critics as his greatest masterpiece. It was a response to Goethe's West-Oestlicher Diwan, which in turn was inspired by Hafiz. Thus Iqbal's "*Payam*" besides having been written in Persian, owes its spiritual inspiration also to Iran at the second remove.

The other Persian works of Iqbal are the *Zabur-i-Ajam* (Persian Psalms), the "*Javed Namah* (the Book of Eternity) the "*Pas Chi Bayad Karday Aqwam-i-Sharq* (What now, O Nations of the East), the Musafir the Traveller) and the Persian poems of the "Armaghan-i-Hijaz" (A Gift from the Hijaz).

Although he had become famous as an Urdu poet much earlier than as a poet of Persian, and in Urdu

he is ranked as one of three greatest (the other being Mir and Ghalib) his Persian work is of a more lasting character and has already served to spread his ideas and influence beyond Pakistan, India and the Muslim world.

Among Persian poets, Iqbal is most deeply indebted to Rumi, whom he regards as his spiritual guide and preceptor, his "*Murshid*".

مرشد رومی حکیم پاک زاد
سر مرگ و زندگی بر ما کشاد

Rumi, the holy one, the spiritual guide
Has revealed to me the mysteries of life and death.

Rumi, easily the greatest mystic poet of Persian or probably any other language, is dedicated to the idea of the development of human personality like Iqbal, but he does not share Iqbal's concern for social good. In regard to his art, Iqbal was greatly influenced by Hafiz, although he reacted sharply to his outlook on life and thereby caused violent controversy.

هوشیار از حافظ صهبا گسار
جامش از زهر اجل سرمایه دار

Beware of Hafiz the winebibber
His goblet is filled with deadly poison

said he in the "Asrar-i-Khudi"

He later dropped the offending passage and made it clear that his condemnation was not aimed at Hafiz personally but his philosophy of life.

Next to Rumi and Hafiz, Iqbal ownes his inspiration to Jami and Sanai, alongwith in lesser degree, Urfi, Naziri, Faizi, Saib Kalim and a number of

other persian poets of Iran or of the Indo-Pakistan subcontinent.

Iqbal was deeply interested in the political and socio-economic resurgence of Iran. When he wrote his "Payam-i-Mashriq," he looked round the Muslim world and was disappointed with the prevailing state of affairs. Of Iran he said :

خاک ایران ماند و ایرانی نماند

The land of Iran still remains, but there are no Iranis to speak of.

(Incidentally, Kashmir, the land of his ancestors, was deeply imbued with Iranian culture and tradition and was known as "Iran-i-Saghir" (Little Iran).

With the rise of Raza Shah Pahlavi, he felt happy and confident of Iran's future.

پهلوی آن وارثِ تختِ قباد
ناخن او عقدهٔ ایران کشاد

Pahlavi the heir to Qubads throne,
Has unravelled Iran's knotty problem.

There was a stage when the secular nationalistic trend in Iran did not please him and he felt that Iran's increasing involvement in Pre-Islamic Persian tradition was vitiating the country's spiritual dedication to Islam.

دل به رستم داد و از حیدر گزشت

He gave his heart to Rustam and cared not for Haider (*i.e.* Ali).

But his burning love for Iran and its people was by no means diminished :

چون چراغِ لاله سوزم در خیابانِ شما
ای جوانانِ عجم جانِ من و جانِ شما

I burn like the lamp of the tulip in your garden.
May my life be yours, O brave men of Iran !

And when he contemplated the future of the Muslim world, Iran occupied the pivotal position as the centre of a Muslim League of Nations.

تہران ہو گر عالمِ مشرق کا جنیوا
شاید کرۂ ارض کی تقدیر بدل جائے

If Teheran were to be the Geneva of the East.
The destiny of the globe might change for the better.

Iran, on its part, has shown increasing appreciation of Iqbal and his message. In 1942, the Malik-us-Suara Bahar, the most eminentpoet of twentieth century Iran, wrote :

عصرِ حاضر خاصۂ اقبال گشت
واحدی کز صد ہزاران بر گزشت

The modern age has become the age of Iqbal
He is one whose achievement exceeds that of hundreds of thousands.

Muhit Tabatabi, a well-known scholar and man of letters, brought out a special issue of his journal "Amozish-O-Parwarish" in 1944. In 1949, "Iqbal-i-Lahori" the first book on Iqbal in Persian, was published by Mujtaba Minovi, the famous Iranian scholar and historian. Since then the tributes paid to Iqbal have been countless, and he has come to be recognised as one of the great poet-philosophers of the Persian language. Malik-us-Suara Bahar had planned to write a book on Iqbal's style which he did not live to undertake. Those who have written on Iqbal include

such distinguished names as Ali Akbar Dih Khuda. Badiuzzaman Faruzanfar, Sadiq Sarmad, Syed Hasan Taqi Zadeh, and Said Naficey.

There has never been such a touching act of homage as that of Naficey who came to Lahore and stood by Iqbal's grave, where he recited a poem beginning :

بخاکِ پاکِ تو آمد غباری از ایران
کشای چشم و سر از خاک یک زمان بردار

To the sacred precinets of thy tomb has come a handful of dust from Iran.

Open thine eyes and lift thy head from the earth awhile.

That was a perfect symbol of Iran's love for Iqbal which is but a reflection of Iqbal's own love for Iran.

Published in "Morning News", Sunday April 21, 1974

A Nation is Born

Iqbal symbolises the renaissance of Islam in the twentieth century, a regeneration of its intellectual movement and the spirit of culture.

His life forms an interesting study for us from more than one point of view. In the first place, he represents a process of mental and spiritual development starting from modern nationalism, but moving away from it as its incompatibility with the broad human outlook of Islam unfolded itself to him, and as he studied the political and cultural limitations of modern nationalism at close quarters in Europe and in the sub-continent. This process of development is, in certain repects, shared by the other two leaders of the Pakistan movement, Syed Ahmed Khan and Jinnah, both of whom started with the idea of Indian nationalism but had to renounce it later in the light of experience.

Secondly, Iqbal defined and identified the fundamental values of Islam in the context of modern thought. Where does Islam stand in the currents and cross-currents of modern scientific and philosophical concepts ? How do we find our bearings in these new surroundings and what path are we to take to reach our goal ? What part can Islam play in the modern world

with its national and racial strife and its social, economic and cultural antagonisms ? These were some of the important questions that presented themselves to Iqbal, on which he spent a life time of study. For him, Islam was not a mere device for Muslims to adjust themselves to the changing conditions around them ; it was living force for freeing the outlook of man from its geographical and racial limitations and for fashioning a new world out of the old. It had its own course to pursue in the future as in the past. Iqbal believed that "Islam is itself destiny and will not suffer a destiny."

Iqbal's contribution towards the education of the Muslim consciousness in our times is vast and versatile. He was an outstanding scholar of Arabic and Persian and Sanskrit. He also knew German. In English he has a style of his own, clear concise, compact style. He was acknowledged as an outstanding Islamist by the world of scholarship, and a number of European scholars and orientalists were in correspondence with him in matters of academic and historical interest. His poetic genius found spontaneous expression in his philosophical poems the *Asrar-i-Khudi* and the *Rumuz-i-Bekhudi*—the 'Secrets of the self' and 'Mysteries of Selflessness' which convey, in word of rare beauty, the vital meaning and message of Islam. Above all he focussed his attention on the political conflict and intellectual crisis of the world of the early twentieth century and in that context, made a serious study of the social and cultural foundations of Islam and of the principle of movement inherent

in its structure. In his 'Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam', he put forward an ordered philosophy and pointed the way to the revitalisation of Muslim Society. He has written some of the greatest poetry ever produced in Urdu or Persian, or indeed in any of the other languages we know. As a Muslim he regarded humanity as one and was deeply interested in all aspects of human activity. He reached out in all directions to gether knowledge and inspiration and has conveyed it to world culture. His work gives us a view of a whole panorama of human civilisation, and as we read him, we find ourselves on terms of intimacy with the great minds of all ages, with whom he encourages us to agree or disagree. His broad and unbiased attitude towards all systems of thought and belief and his universal outlook on cultures and civilizations, make him undoubtedly one of the great humanists of all time.

Above all, Iqbal is the father of the Pakistan idea. He dreamt the great drama, although did not live to see it come true. Or was it a vision that he saw, a vision of the shape of things to come, the kind of vision that comes only to the seeing eye? For Iqbal was a seer. Just as Nietzsche foretold the rise of Russia in the twentieth century and Tennyson the development of civil aviation and of aerial warfare and the United Nations, Iqbal had foreseen the establishment of Pakistan. As early as 1909, he had, in a letter to Ghulam Qadir Farrukh of Amritsar, rejected the idea of the so-called Hindu-Muslim unity, which he described as romantic but impracticable. In his Presidential address

to the All-India Muslim League at Allahabad on the 29th December, 1930, he stated clearly that "Self-government within the British Empire or without the British Empire, the formation of a consolidated North-West Indian Muslim State" appeared to him to be "the final destiny of the Muslims, at least of North-West India." Subsequently he included Bengal in his scheme, and re-affirmed his idea in a letter to Jinnah in 1937.

Iqbal's demand for a consolidated Muslim State was met by bitter criticism some of which was aimed at him personally. He defended his views and stuck to them without entering into any personal controversy, which he never did any time in his life. It may be interesting to recall that when Iqbal was facing these acrimonious criticisms there was no one in the Sub-continent at the time to share his idea, or the blame, for it, even though a number of claimants have sprung up later.

Speaking of the 1930 Address, I am reminded of a personal anecdote. When Iqbal returned to Lahore from Allahabad I went to see him. I was still a student at college and felt greatly perturbed at his reference to self-government for the new Muslim state 'within the British Empire.' Why did you say that: Sir, said I, "Why must our Muslim State remain with the British Empire?" His first response was a smile. "You will notice," said he, "that I have said 'self-government within" but there are so many others who have told me they are worried about 'without'. "But why did you have to say that at all, sir" I insisted, "Because," said he "while I see that establishment of

a Muslim State as inevitable in the process of history, I cannot see clearly, at least at present, whether it will be within or without the British Empire." I had to keep quiet. Here was a man who was utterly loyal to his vision, who told you what he saw clearly, and what he did not.

Iqbal not only foresaw Pakistan, but also the difficulties it was going to have to face from the beginning of its career. He saw the conflict and the bloodshed that was coming and he also saw where it would mainly take place. In 1936, in a letter to Moulvi Abdul Haq of the Anjuman-e-Urdu he wrote :

"The battles that the Muslims will have to fight for their self-preservation will have the Punjab as their battle-field. In this the Punjabi Muslims will have to face considerable difficulties, for during the days of Muslim rule they were not educated properly in their responsibilities. This, however, cannot be helped, for it is quite clear that this is the land where the fighting will be."

This amazing prophecy found its initial fulfilment in the mass killings and migration of population in 1947 at the time of Independence. It has been more than fulfilled in the recent Indo-Pakistan conflict. Whether or not the prophecy has exhausted itself we do not know.

Earlier in 1912, he had said :

"The lips dare not disclose what the eye doth see.
I am amazed at the way the world is going to change".

He has not given us any details of what he saw, but in the very next verse he has told us which way

he saw the world would go :

"The darkness of night will flee before the light of the morning sun.
This Garden will be filled with the song of the glory of God."

A few years latter he had his greatest vision :

"What should not be shall cease to be—all that ever was.
What hath not been but ought to be, the same shall come to pass."

Iqbal similarly had a clear vision of the Kashmir struggle. Before there was any sign of agitation in Kashmir, he saw the gathering storm on the horizon. In a poem written in *Nishat Bagh* in Kashmir, which is included in the *Payam-e-Mashriq*, the 'Message of the East'—he referred to the plight of the common Kashmiri :

"While his master wears the silken robe woven by his labour.
He himself is condemned to be in tatters"

Iqbal goes on to call on the cupbearer to arouse the Kashmiri's courage and inspire him to action :

"O moon-faced Saqi O may I be thy sacrifice :
Bring me the heady wine of our ancestors.
And sprinkle of it on the Kashmiri,
That sparks of fire may arise from his humble dust !"

Some time after this poem was written the Kashmir agitation began. To Iqbal's own surprise, it started with a labour revolt in the silk factory to which he had referred.

Iqbal's own family came from Kashmir and he was devoted to the welfare of the down-trodden people of that beautiful land which the East India

Company sold away to the Maharaja Gulab Singh for a mere seventy five lac of Rupees. Early in his career, Iqbal was for years Secretary on the Kashmiri Association. He was conscious of his Kashmiri origin. In a couplet which sums up his whole personality he says :

"I am a rose from the Paradise of Kashmir
My heart comes from the sacred land of the Hijaz
And my voice from Shiraz."

When he recalled the East India Company's deal over Kashmir, he could not help exclaiming :

"Fields, streams and gardens and peasants too, they sold away,
They sold away a whole people and how cheaply did they sell !

When he thought of the misfortunes of the people of Kashmir, the unlimited potentialities they possessed and the tyranny that warped and destroyed their lives, he felt infinitely sad :

"That Kashmir which till yesterday the discerning once called 'Little Iran.'
Is destitute and helpless and bound in utter subjugation today.
A sigh of grief goes up from the bosom of the Heavens themselves.
When the simple and honest man is brow-beaten by Kings and Princelings
Behold the old peasant's house of woe at the foot of the hill.
It tells the story of the ruthlessness of the times.
Alas for this people, so noble, artistic and full of invention !
Where is Thy Judgement Day. O God !
O thou Who art so alow to punish !"

But Iqbal has faith that Kashmir will not die :

> "That honoured land which has the Chiner's fire in the essence of its being
> Never will that land grow cold and lifeless.

"What about the future? asks Iqbal. The answer is given in the *Javid Namah* 'the Book of Eternity' —and is conveyed by Syed Ali Hamdani, the great saint of Kashmir, whose spirit meets Iqbal in the transcedental regions beyond the Heavens :

> "When he (the Kashmiri) comes to holds his life cheap as the wind.
> The very walls of his prison-house will shake before him
> Then his axe will split granite asunder.
> And he will grab his rightful share from Destiny itself!
> Here, as everywhere else, Iqbal leaves us with a message of hope.

Today Iqbal and Pakistan are synonymous. It is significant that the Indian attack on Pakistan in September, 1965 was concentrated mainly on two cities, Sialkot and Lahore, the former being birth-place of Iqbal, and the latter the city where he lived and died. It is no less significant that during this war the people of Pakistan turned instinctively to Iqbal for inspiration and sustenance. The battle that Pakistan has had to fight for its survival has brought to the force the whole background of its existence. Before the independence, when the Muslims were struggling for Pakistan a number of European and American voices were heard against the Pakistan movement. The British Government were officially opposed to it, and it was a refreshing exception to find a man like Beverly Nichols supporting it. Since independence, the same

kind of attitude has persisted even at well-informed and well-meaning quarters. The argument is that most of the Muslims in the sub-continent are local converts and are of the same race as the non-Muslims. The outsiders have been comparatively few, and form no more than a fraction of the total Muslim population. Thus, the race being largely the same, why should there be two countries instead of one ? I have always found it difficult to understand this argument, particularly when it emanates from European and American quarters. Let us take the Europe of today. According to the experts, there is a basic racial unity in the European Sub-continent. "The racial characteristic of the Europe of today", says Professor Dixon of Harvard, "is the dominance of the Alpine and Palae-Alpines. Except for portions of Southern Scandinavia, the Western Baltic lands and shores of the North Sea, the British Isles and the Iberian Peninsula, Corsica, Sardinia, Sicily and Southern Italy, together with small areas in West Central France and South Eastern Russia, the whole continent is dominated by brachycephalic types which are themselves central, whereas the dolichocephalic types, are mainly marginal''. Let us add to this the fact that the civilisation and culture of Europe as a whole Garaeco-Roman foundation. There is also a common background of historical experience in the shape of the Roman Empire, the spread of Christianity, the Crusades, the Renaissance and the Reformation. The development of the Fine Arts also has an All European basis. For example, even now the Russian ballet and the Russian theatre, in spite of their communist environment, are a part of European culture.

So as Goethe, Shakespeare, Dante, Voltaire, Victor Hugo, Ibsen, Dostoevsky, Tolstoy, Pasternak and even Sholokov. So too are the musicians, men like Beethoven, Mozart and Leopardi ; the artists, such as Leonardo da Vinci, Michelangelo, Rubens, and Tibtian ; the philosophers, such as Socrates, Plato, Kant. Rousseau, Schopenhauer, Nietschze and Bergson, and the scientists, like Newton, Einsteins, Max Planck, Made Curie, Pavlov and Heisenberg. The Europeans have the same classics, the same Greek and Latin sources of inspiration, the same scientific outlook, the same way of living, and the same approach to the basic problems of life. And yet there are more than twenty countries in Europe, which are most of the time uneasy in each other's company. Similarly in South America, we have practically the same race and yet there are so many different countries in the area with their own political ambitions and aspirations. Even in the United States, which is pre-eminently a melting pot of nationalities, where populations have migrated from all parts of Europe and the rest of the world, and where a new world outlook is developing, there are still a number of different cultural groups which are likely to continue for some time before they assimilated into the American system.

The explanation for the existing multiplicity and diversity of states in the Western world may partly lie in existence of separate linguistic group (we may even say perhaps, in this context, that American English is different from English, English, Canadian French from French French, and Swiss German from

German) even though there are, on the other hand, also some conspicuously multilingual states like Canada, Switzerland, and the U.S S.R. The more important reason seems to the geographical divisions introduced by mountains and rivers and the impact of historical accident on the group consciousness of various units of population which now receive inspiration mainly from the highly emotional idea of 'the glory of the Fatherland' and their military and economic superiority over other national groups which helps them to establish political hegemony over them.

We have seen how, in spite of a large racial and cultural unity the Western world is divided into so many independent states whose friendliness towards each other cannot always be taken for granted. Is there anything very strange, then, in the existence of two independent states in the Indo-Pakistan Subcontinent? Let us look into the matter a little more closely.

In the first place, is it a fact, let us ask, that Pakistan and India are racially of the same stock? Let us also ask whether the sub-continent is inhabited by one race? I am afraid that the answer to both questions is in the negative. Even as far back as the Indus Valley civilisation, the answer was in the negative. The human remains discovered during the excavations at Mohenjodaro, as Sewell and Guha tell us in 'Mohenjodaro and the Indus Civilisation' edited by Sir John Marshall, disclose the existence of at least four racial types, the Proto-Austroloid race, the Mediterranean race, the Monogolian branch

of the Alpine stock and the Alpine race. This was the position in pre-historic times. As we all know, in course of time, many ethnic groups, such as the Aryans, the Scythians, the Kushans, the Huns and the Semitics migrated to the Sub-continent, peacefully or otherwise. This racial diversity according to Professor Dixon, lies at the root of the Caste System in India. His analysis of the data available led him to the conclusion that 'Caste groups do differ from each other racially, and that the social status of the caste usually bears a direct relation to the racial composition of its members".

So much for racial unity. As regards language according to Mario Pei, author of the 'Story of Language', "India has thirty-three major tongues along with a host of minor tongues and dialects". At present there is hardly any language common to India and Pakistan except English which has been inherited from the British administration and which both countries regard as a temporary expedient. Urdu, which developed as a result of Hindu-Muslim contact in the days of Muslim rule and which was *lingua franca* of the larger part of the Sub-continent before Independence, has been replaced in India by the highly Sanskritised Hindi, which cannot be understood by people in Pakistan. Pakistani Urdu has, on the other hand shown a tendency to become more Persianised and Arabicised than before. Similarly, the Bengali Language in East Pakistan has shown a different trend from the Bengali of West Bengal and Calcutta both in form and content. In the circumstances, if there was at any time a common

linguistic factor between India and Pakistan, it is virtually no more.

The next question to consider is whether the Sub-continent was at any time a political unit in the true sense of the word. Starting from about 500 B.C. which represents more or less the dawn of history in the Sub-continent, we find that before the advent of the Muslims, the Sub-continent, as a whole, was hardly ever consolidated into a single political and administrative unit, except, perhaps, for a few years under Ashoka. With the Muslim conquest, the larger part of the Sub-continent was brought under centralized control and during the reign of Alauddin Khalji in the fourteenth century Malik Kafoor, the famous general, also subdued almost the entire region of South India. Subsequently disintegration set in and it was not till the Mughals came to power that India was again ruled by a strong hand at the Centre. After the death of Aurangzeb in 1707, the Provincial Governors gradually became independent, even though some semblance of allegiance to the Mughal throne was maintained for some time in certain cases. In any case, the Sub-continent was far from being politically united when the British took over. Indeed, the lack of political unity was one of the main reasons for the success of the new rulers. The British who ruled the larger part of the Sub-continent for two hundred years and the whole of it for a century, consolidated the administration of the Sub-continent with the help of roads, railways, posts and telegraphs and improved inland water transport. Towards the end, air communications were also

established within the country. Incidentally, Burma was also part of British India until it was separated from India in 1937, ten years before the Sub-continent itself was partitioned. Burma had never been part of India, and its inclusion in the British Indian dominions gave the whole British administration an artificial complexion. Moreover, the British were always regarded as foreign rulers and their own administrative convenience rather than any process of inner political evolution. The consolidation did not grow from within ; it was imposed from without. Nevertheless, when in the latter half of the nineteenth century the British government began to think of devolution of political power to the people of the country and constitutional reforms began by instalments, the Hindu intellectuals of the time were quick to take advantage of the British consolidation of the Sub-continent. Having come into contact with European ideas of nationalism and democracy, these politically conscious intellectuals who were the main force behind the newly formed Indian National Congress, which the British Indian Government under Lord Dufferin had themselves promoted and fostered, saw a rare opportunity before them, and in the name of democratic freedom began to claim India for the majority community which was no other than themselves. What they overlooked was the fact that the terms majority and minority can legitimately be applied to political groups under the democratic system only when the population is otherwise homogenous. The Muslims, who regarded themselves as a distinct and separate people, there-

fore, did not take kindly to this orthodox but impracticable view of the future Indian democracy. As the British government desired to associate the people with the administration in increasing measure particularly in the establishment of Provincial autonomy in 1937, the scramble for power and position in the political and administrative set up of the country became more and more bitter and the relation between the Hindus and Muslims deteriorated progressively. Communal riots became so common that the period from 1913 onwards, with a brief interval for the Lucknow Pact and the non-co-operation Movement of 1921, can best be described as one of continued civil war. The Simon Commission counted 112 major communal riots in the Sub-continent in the five years 1923-27 only. The subsequent period was, if any thing, worse than this. Under these conditions the Muslim politicians, who had been active since the foundation of the All-India Muslim League at Dacca in 1906 concentrated their attention on devising safeguards for their people against the dominance of the Hindu majority in a democratic India. The Minto-Morley Reforms of 1909 had conceded separate electorate to Muslims but this was beginning of the solution.

Subsequent events were, however, not encouraging. The Partition of Bengal in 1905, which Lord Curzon understood as an administrative measure, and the consequent establishment of a Province of Eastern Bengal and Assam, which incidentally was a Province with a Muslim majority, was violently opposed by the Hindus.

Its annulment, which was announced by King George V at the Delhi Durbar of 1911, was an occasion for deep frustration for the Muslims and great jubilation for the Hindus. Not withstanding these adverse developments, Muhammad Ali Jinnah, who at the time was President of the All-India Muslim League though still an ardent Indian nationalist, negotiated the lucknow Pact with the Indian National Congress. The Pact confirmed and extended the principle of separate electorates for the Muslims in the Central and Provincial legislatures with reservation of seats, but this could be achieved only at the expense of their majority in the crucial Provinces of the Punjab and Bengal. The Muslims regarded this as too high price to pay as the Pact gave them no effective voice either in the minority provinces or in the Punjab and Bengal where they were in the majority. The atmosphere of goodwill built up by the Pact was shortlived and there was a renewal of communal tension after the Montague Chelmsford Reforms of 1919 transferred power to the elected representatives of the people. The non-co-operation Movement, which brought the Hindus and Muslims nearer each other than at any time before and as a result of which the Hindus under the leadership of Mahatma Ghandhi, all succeeded in destroying the Muslims as a political entity, was followed by the severely communal movements of 'Shuddhi' and 'Sanghtan', which aimed at the wholesale conversion of the Muslims or their expulsion from the Sub-continent and the Muslim reaction in the form of the 'Tabligh' and 'Tanzeem' movements which sought to promote Muslims missionary activity

and the political solidarity of the Muslim community. It is significant that the leaders of both these movements were some of the former leaders of Hindu-Muslim unity, namely Swami Shardhanand, Dr. Moonje and Pandit Malaviya on the one hand and Dr. Saifuddin Kitchlu on the other. The foundation of the aggressive anti-Muslim Rashtriya Sewak Sangh in 1925 and the increase in the activities of the Militant All-India Hindu Mahasabha increased the fears of the Muslims still further. There were numerous attempts by Muslim leaders, including Jinnah's famous 'Fourteen Points', to arrive at some solution which may provide satisfactory safe-guards to the Muslim community. No such solution was forthcoming, as none was acceptable to the Hindus.

The Nehru Report, which represented the thinking of the Hindu-dominated Nehru Committee about the future Constitution of sub-continent, recommended a unitary form of Government and repudiated the principles of separate electorates and weightage for the Muslims in the provinces in which they were in the minority. This Report was followed by the Simon Commission which represented British thinking about future Constitutional Reforms. From the Muslim point of view, this report also went against them, particularly on the issues of their adequate representation in the Punjab and Bengal Assemblies, and raising the status of the Frontier and Baluchistan Provinces. The report was followed by two Round Table Conferences in London, at which political leaders from the Sub-continent were invited and asked to agree on a scheme for future, particularly on the

issue of representation for various communities. No settlement, however, was reached at these conferences, with the result that the British Prime Minister, Ramsay Macdonald, had to give his own Award on the issue. The Award, while conceding the continuance of separate electorates, maintained the previous position in regard to the majority provinces of the Punjab and Bengal where the Muslim majority was not allowed to be reflected in the legislature. All this added to the disappointment of the Muslims.

In the rapidly changing world around them, the Muslims, who were poorer and less educated than the Hindus and had little influence in the administration, were preoccupied with the idea of preserving themselves as a political and social entity in the Subcontinent. They could not, however, think of anything except the somewhat negative approach implied in the demand for safeguards. This led them nowhere, and their frustration increased. It was left to Iqbal to realise that the Muslim needed a State of their own in order to be able to live their life as a people in their own way. This now seems to us have been the obvious solution, but, strange as it may seem, it appeared as a revolutionary idea at the time.

It is hardly possible to understand the political struggle without taking note of two factors which are of basic importance, the economic positions of the Muslims and their status as a distinct and separate cultural entity. I have dealt with the subject at length elsewhere, and would content myself with a brief resume of the position on the present occasion. Let us take up the economic factor first. The Muslims

ruled the sub-continent for more than a thousand years and while their administration was moderate and considerate (had it been otherwise, it could not have continued for a thousand years) their own position as rulers was one of undisputed advantage. They had hardly any economic problem to worry about. When, however, their political power declined and the East India Company supplanted them as rulers, they suffered loss of wealth and social status along with their political position. The British, who had taken power from them, had no particular reason to trust them. On the contrary, they began to take early steps to make sure that the Muslims were reduced to a position of helplessness. In Bengal, for instance, after Lord Clive took the Diwani from the Emperor Shah Alam in 1765, the Muslims, who held a majority of posts in the Revenue and Judicial Departments and in the Military, lost these avenues of employment. Again, their educational system suffered from the resumption by the East India Company of the Muslim kings and nobles to Muslims educational institutions. In 1973, Lord Cornawallis, the Governor-General of India, introduced the Permanent Settlement of Bengal which, in the words of James O' Kinealy "elevated the Hindu Collectors, who up to that time had but unimportant posts, to the position of Land-lords, gave them a Proprietory right in the soil, and allowed them to accumulate wealth which would have gone to the Muslims under their own rule". On the other hand, the old Muslim Zamindars, formerly the lords of all they surveyed, were reduced to poverty and destitution. Sir William Hunter has

given us a picture of the misfortune that had overtaken the once powerful Muslim community in India. In 1837, when Persian was replaced by English in the Company's offices, the prospects of employment of Muslims diminished still further. The British policy was to cultivate and trust the Hindu and to leave the Muslim to his fate. Lord Ellenborough as Governor General, wrote to the Duke of Wellington in 1842, urging patronage of the Hindu who, according to him, were nine-tenths of the population, rather than trying to appease the Muslims, who were only one-tenth and could not be reconciled to the British power. "It seems to me most unwise" said he, "when we are sure of the hostility of one-tenths not to secure the enthusiastic support of the nine-tenths which are faithful." The events of 1857 made the Muslim position still worse. Notwithstanding the fact that Hindus and Muslim were jointly responsible for the rebellion and the first mutineer. Mangal Panday, whose name became a generic appellation for all mutineers was a Hindu, the British thought the Muslims were at the root of the trouble. "Tell these rascally Musalmans" said Lieutinant Roberts (Later Field Marshal the Lord Roberts) "that by the grace of God we shall still be masters of India". This kind of feeling led to further persecution of these Muslims. In 1871, after the Crown had taken conducted by E.C. Bailey, a Secretary to the over the administration, a survey of employment there was scarcely a Government Office in Calcutta at that time in which a Muslim could hope for "any

post above the rank of porter, messenger, filler in ink-pots and mender of pens".

The educational movement of Syed Ahmad Khan aroused the Muslims to a sense of their degradation as a community and helped them of some extent to participate in Government administration and economic activity. The Hindus, however, were so far ahead in the race that there was no hope of catching up with them in the ordinary way. On the other hand, the Muslims were growing in population and poverty. From about 18 million in 1850 or thereabouts, they had grown to about 50 million by the turn of the century. In a famous speech in 1907, Iqbal has described abject poverty of the Muslim people. As time went on, there was some improvement in the position, particularly after the British Government had agreed to a reservation of posts in the services for Muslims. The relative position of Hindus and Muslims, however, continued to be that the 'haves' and 'have-nots' down to the Partition. The economic disparity between the two peoples, the almost complete absence of industries in the Pakistan areas (which was hardly noted by any European observer except Professor Coupland) and the lack of any prospects of economic well-being among the Muslims in the face of the Hindu monopoly of the economy was one of the major contributory factors in the demand for Partition. On the 23rd March, 1940, the Muslim League adopted the Pakistan Resolution at its Lahore Session, and thenceforward Pakistan became the accepted goal of the Muslims of the Sub-continent.

Nevertheless, in 1946, the Muslims, in the interest of peaceful political evolution, agreed, under Jinnah's leadership, to accept the Cabinet Mission Plan which envisaged an undivided India with Group System which would have allowed some freedom for economic development for the Pakistan areas in the Indus and the Ganges-Brahmaputra Basins. It was, however, precisely this feature of the Plan which provoked Hindu opposition. The Plan, therefore, did not go forward. It was the last of an innumerable series of attempts to find a solution to the Hindu-Muslim problem in an undivided India. It failed because the Hindus failed to inspire any confidence among the Muslims and indeed, succeeded only in giving the impression that they wanted to damage, if not altogether destroy the political, cultural and economic position of the Muslim community. The outbreaks of communal violence against the Muslims culminating in the Bihar tragedy of 1946 did nothing to allay these fears. There was no question any more of Hindus and Muslims living together ; they had to part and part they did.

More important than the economic aspect of Hindu-Muslim relationship is the cultural aspect. Indeed, it is the most fundamental line of cleavage between Hindus and Muslims. In order to understand the significance of this cleavage, it is necessary to bear in mind the revolutionary impact of the Islamic movement on men and peoples. Those who accept Islam, have their whole personality transformed, with a clear break with the past and a complete

change of direction. Islam, with its distinct moral values and approach to the problems of life, binds its adherents into a compact ideological community. History gives us more than one example of a people who started their career by a compaign of destruction against Muslim countries and Muslim culture and ended up by becoming devout adherents of Islam. The Saljuqs and the Mongols are two such examples. "Just as in the case of the Saljuqs" says Professor Hitti, speaking of the Ii-Khans, "the religion of the Moslems had conquered where their arms had failed. Less than half a century of Hulagu's merciless attempt at the destruction of Islamic culture, his great grand-son Ghazan, as a devout Moslem, was consecrating much time any energy to the revivification of that same culture".

The fact that a large number of Muslims in Pakistan and the rest of the Sub-continent and descendants of Hindu converts to Islam is irrelevent, for once a man becomes a Muslim, his whole outlook on life becomes different. His loyalty and allegiance and his whole attitude to life and the Universe—in a word, his Weltanschauung—is completely changed. As an example of the dynamic impact of the Islam, we may mention Iqbal himself, who was a Kashmiri Brahmin of the Sapru caste by origin and who has become the greatest exponent of Muslim thought in modern times.

The problem of culture in the Sub-continent is not as simple as it is some time ought to be. In the course of a thousand years of Muslim rule contacts

developed between the ruler and the ruled, particularly after the first five centuries of Turkish sway, and a semblance of a common culture emerged. This culture, which was shared by the upper strata of Hindu and Muslim society, had inevitable a Muslim bias. It was based on Persian language and literature, in which both Hindus and Muslims acquired proficiency and produced poets, writers and scholars of eminence. We have, for example, Tekchand Bahar, the great lexicographer of the Persian language and Chandar Bhan Brahman the famous poet, and a whole host of Hindu scholars of Persian. The Mughal school of painting produced some outstanding Hindu artists like Manohar and Bachitter, while the old classical Hindu music was supplemented and improved by eminent Muslim like Amir Khusro, Sultan Hussain Sharqi and Mian Tan Sen. Again, the Bhakti movement with its emphasis on monotheism was a product of Islam's impact on Hinduism, and produced such great men as Guru Nanak, Kabir and Chaitanya. Social contacts in the upper layers of Hindu and Muslim society were frequent and intimate, culminating in Akbar's marriages with a number of Hindu princesses and similar other matrimonial alliances. The Hindus filled a large number of civil and military offices, including some of the highest. Todar Mal Khatri, who was the Revenue Minister of Sher Shah Suri before he became Imperial Chancellor under Akbar, Hemu the grocer, the Commander-in-Chief of the Suri forces at the Second Battle of Panipat and Man Singh, one of the highest ranking generals of the Mughal Army, are three out of many examples.

The judicial system aimed at even-handed justice to Hindu and Muslims alike. Kings and Emperors were personally accessible to any one who cared to knock at their door for justice. Trade and industry was largely in the hands, of the Hindus, who were free to exercise their religion. In the lower strata of society, they were free even to maintain, as they did a social boycott of the Muslims throughout the period of Muslim rule. The Muslim rulers had settled down in the country and had served their connections with their ancestral territories of origin, the Hindus never really accepted them as their own. They were still 'Maleches', the low and the impure ; or 'Jabans'. the hateful foreigners, as Bankim Chatterjee calls them.

The Muslim rulers generally maintained an atmosphere of peace and tranquility which encouraged friendly relations between Hindus and Muslims. It must be admitted, however, that, as was inevitable, the relationship between ruler and ruled was not always a balanced one. Moreover, there is no doubt that with all the concessions they enjoyed, the Hindus were a subject people. The relationship between a ruling people and a ruled population can never be a healthy one and is bound to leave a trial of bitterness behind it. You cannot accept gratitude from the people you rule. It was hardly surprising, therefore, to find that as soon as Muslim power declined and the British established their authority over the Sub-continent, the Hindus lost no time in turning their back on their former rulers and in ingratiating

themselves with the new power in the land. Soon the last vestiges of the Hindu-Muslim culture disappeared. The Urdu language, which has a foundation of Sanskrit and a super-structure of Persian and which developed as a result of Hindu-Muslim contact under Muslim rule, is a particular case in point. Some of the great poets and writers of this language have been Hindu like Daya Shankar Nasim, author of the classic poem 'Gulzar-i-Nasim' or 'Gul Bakavali', Rattan Nath Sarshar, author of another classic, the prose romance of the 'Fasana-i-Azad' and a number of other well-known works, Prem Chand, the greatest short story writer of the language, Ufaq Lakhnavi,, Barq Dehlavi, and Naubat Rai Nazar Lakhnavi, all front rank poets and writers, Brij Narain Chakbast Lakhnavi, outstanding poet, writer and critic, Lala Sri Ram, author of the monumental 'Khumkhana-i-Javed', the best known biographical dictionary of Urdu poets and writers, Pyare Lal Ashob a pioneer of the Urdu language in the Punjab, Ram Babu Saksena, author of the best known history of Urdu literature. Daya Narain Nigam, editor of one of the foremost Urdu literary magazines—the 'Zamanah'—Suraj Narain Mihr, one of the best known writers of children's poems, Talok Chand Mahrum and Labhu Ram Josh Malsiani, both poets of high rank (the latter an authority on the Urdu language), Durga Sahai Saroor, a leader of the transition from the neo-classical to the modern Urdu school of poetry, Professor Firaq Gorakhpuri, an outstanding exponent of the new Ghazal, Anand Narain Mulla, a polished and versatile poet and writer, Pandit Brij Mohan

Dattatrya Kaifi, famous scholar, poet and writer, and a number of others. Even in our own generation, we have had men of the stature of Hari Chand Akhtar, a master of the Urdu ghazal, Rajinder Singh Bedi and Balvant Singh, two of the best short story writers of Urdu, Arsh Malsiani, Jagan Nath Azad, Dwarka Dass Shula and Munawwar Lakhnavi, who rank with the best poets of their generation, Malik Ram, a scholar of great eminence and an authority on Ghalib, and a great many others. Indeed, no account of Urdu language and literature would be worth the paper it is written on if the Hindu contribution were to be omitted from it. And yet Urdu became an early victim of the Hindu hostility towards the Muslims. The Hindus began to promote Hindi as against Urdu and some of the most acrimonious controversies of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries centered round the Urdu-Hindi problem. Indeed, the French scholar, Garcin de Tassey, was moved by these controversies to remark that the Hindu wanted to do away with every thing that reminded them of Muslim rule.

In the new environment in which the two communities found themselves under the British Raj, with the old common culture disappearing, both the Hindus and the Muslims were thrown back on themselves, and there was a revival of culture on both sides. When they were not concentrating on their own culture, the Hindus and Muslims could live together in an atmosphere of social and cultural amity, but with the revival of Hindu and Muslim culture

which took place in the latter half of the eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth century, the differences were seen to be obvious and fundamental. Let us take the Hindu and Muslim views on some of the important problems of life. The Hindu view of Ultimate Reality is flexible, while the Muslim view is not. You may believe in one God or in a million gods or no god at all and yet you can be a Hindu. A Muslim, however, can remain a Muslim, only if he believes in one God and one alone. Let us take the influence of the incidence of birth on the social status of the human individual. A hindu is expected to be loyal to the caste in which he is born. If he is a Shudra, he has to be a good Shudra. He should perform all the duties of a Shudra and not aspire any higher. As Ambedkar tells us, a Shudra is not expected to aspire even to listening to the Sacred Vedas; if he does, he may have molten lead poured into his ears. Good conduct may enable him to be born in a higher caste in the next life. On the other hand, a bad Shurda may descend to the body of a lower animal when born again. Islam, on the other hand, recognises no caste system. A man may be born in any station in life, he is entitled to rise to the highest rung of the social ladder on his merits. The Slav Kings of India and the Mamlukes of Egypt are remarkable examples of men born in slavery or descended from slaves rising to the highest positions of power. Again, coming to habits of eating and drinking, Hindu and Muslims do not eat drink together, except when they have been Europeanised

beyond redemption. A good Hindu would not let a Muslim touch his glass or his eating utensils. Again, rightly or wrongly the Muslim is found of eating the cow and, rightly or wrongly, the Hindu regards it, as a sacred animal entitled to protection. The Hindu loves music, which forms an integral part of his devotional activities. The Muslim may like music, but would not like to mix it with his prayers. That is why we have had so much blood-shed over cow-slaughter and music before mosques. In the field of literature, the Hindu sources of inspiration lie largely in Sanskrit and its dialects, while the Muslim turns to Persian and Arabic. Mario Pei makes an acute observation when he points out that Gandhi, the Hindu leader, derived his title 'Mahatma' from Sanskrit, while Jinnah, the leader of the Muslims, had his popular name of 'Quaid-e-Azam' from Arabic. Before Independence, the Indian National Congress adopted 'Bande Mataram' as the national song of India, without regard to the fact that this song, which occurs in Bankim Chander Chatterjee's 'Anando Moth' is written as a battle cry against the foreigner, including the Muslims. Added to all this is the fact that the process of history which forms the main explanation of the separate existence of so many states in the Western world, has produced persons in the Sub-continent in the course of a thousand years or so of Muslim rule who have come to be regarded as heroes by the Muslims and villains by the Hindus and *vice versa*. Shivaji and Aurangzeb are two well-known examples. Their quarrel was political, but in the nineteeth century, the Hindu nationalists gave it a

deeply communal colour and made Shivaji a national hero of the Hindus. To this the Muslim re-acted by making Aurangzeb a hero of Islam.

The relationship between Hindus and Muslims at the beginning of the twentieth century is illustrated by an anecdote related by Sir Walter Lawrence in his book 'The India We Served'. "Sir Partab (the Maharaja of Idar)", says Sir Walter, "had come up to Simla to be present at a farewell dinner Lord Curzon gave to my wife and myself the night before we left and after the dinner, Sir Partab and I sat up till two o'clock in the morning taking of his hopes and ambitions. One of his ambitions was to annihilate the Muslim people in India. I deprecated this prejudice and mentioned Muslim friends common to both of us. 'Yes', he said, 'I like them too, but very much like them dead."

It is sometimes suggested that the sub-continent forms one geographical unit. While it is true that the sea and the Himalayas provide a geographical boundary, the inherent geographical unity of the sub-continent is far from obvious. Indeed, it would appear that the area south of the Vindhiachals which is technically a peninsula, with its separate physiography, terrain and climate, has hardly any connection with the rest of the sub-continent. In the same way, the Indus Basin and the Ganges-Brahmaputra Basin, which broadly represented West and East Pakistan respectively, are self-contained geographical (and economic) units, distinct from all others. Similarly, Rajputana is a separate arid zone. The divers

in natural geography in the sub-continent has resulted in a variety of climate, with a variety of related features, such as fauna and flora. As a matter of interest, the sub-continent has areas of the heaviest and the lowest rainfalls in the world, namely Cheranpunji and the desert areas around Khairpur respectively. Similarly, we have in the sub-continent what has so far been regarded as the hottest place on earth, namely Jacobabad, while, at the same time, we have some extremely cold places in the Himalayan regions. In the circumstances, it must take a great deal of courage on the part of anyone to assert the geographical unity of the ub-continent.

Speaking of geographical units, would it not be correct to say that North Ireland and Eire are one unit, and Canada and the U.S.A., excluding certain extremely situated areas, another unity?

Again, it has been said that the separation of East and West Pakistan by a thousand miles of Indian territory makes Pakistan an unusual geographical phenomenon. At first sight this may appear to be so, but a little reflection would place this phenomenon at least on the same footing as the U.S A. and Alaska, not to mention Hawaii.

Let us try to sum up. We have seen that there is no racial or linguistic unity between India and Pakistan. We have also seen that the revival of Muslim culture on the one hand and of Hindu culture on the other has disclosed the existence of an unbridgeable gulf between the Hindus and the Muslims. With cultural outlooks so divergent, it is impossible to think

that two people would be prepared to live together and devote their combined efforts to a joint purposes. We have also seen the growth of economic disparity between Hindus and Muslims under British rule, a disparity which could not have been remedied in an undivided India with the Hindus holding a monopoly of economic power. We have also had a glimpse of the political process which caused ceaseless controversy and growing bitterness between the two peoples. We have also seen that the sub-continent was never really a political unit (nor it is a geographical unit). Whatever political unity was achieved from time to time was imposed from without by strong and alien rulers.

Our study of the past makes it clear that history charted different courses for the Hindus and the Muslims in the sub-continent. It could not have been otherwise. There was hardly anything in common between them. The question before the Muslims was whether they should live as a free and independent people, preserving their religion and their culture for themselves, or should let themselves be merged into the Caste System of Hindu India, with its inhuman limitations. But Islam is too vital a force to suffer such a fate. The result, therefore, was the Partition of the sub-continent. This was inevitable. There were historical forces working themselves to their logical conclusion. The Hindus, with rare exceptions like G.C. Gokhale and C.R. Das, did not understand these forces and were therefore, not amenable to the obvious solution until it was wrested from their hands.

The Muslims, on the other hand, were fortunate enough to produce a seer—call him a visionary if you will—who could discern the inner process of history behind the outward events and give voice to the latent aspirations of the Muslims in clear and unambiguous terms. Pakistan represents the struggle of Muslim Culture to survive in this part of the world. "The construction of a polity on national lines", said he, "if it means the displacement of the Islamic principle of solidarity is simply unthinkable to a Muslim." He demanded the formation of a consolidated Muslim State in the best interest of Islam and India. That, for him, was the only way to peace in the sub-continent, provided, of course, that the Hindu showed understanding of the position. Let us hope that, in spite of all that has happened, a proper understanding of the meaning of Pakistan will dawn on those who are still somewhat confused about it. It is only through such an understanding on the part of the Indian rulers and the world at large that a permanent solution can be found of the problems of the Indo-Pakistan sub-continent.

Index